THE

DEFENCE

OF THE

Nonconformists

Plea for Peace,

OR

An Account of the Matter of their

NONCONFORMITY,

Against Mr. *J. Cheney's* Answer,

Called { *The Conforming Nonconformist,* And *The Nonconforming Conformist.*

To which is added the Second Part

In Answer to

Mr. *Cheney's* Five Undertakings.

By RICHARD BAXTER.

LONDON,

Printed for *Benjamin Alsop,* at the *Angel* over against the *Stocks-Market.* 1680.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

THE PREFACE.

Reader,

TOo many of the contentions of this age do tell the world how much the ſeveral parties differ in Piety and Malignity, Humility and Pride, Love and Malice, Meekneſs and Cruelty; But I think verily the controverſie here managed between this brother and me, doth but tell you how weak and fumbling a thing mans underſtanding is here in the fleſh, and what great diverſity of apprehenſions all men have in many things, who agree in the main; and how diverſity of Lights or appearances, may

may cauſe great and confident contrariety of judgments, yea, and changes in the ſame perſon. The difference between Paul *and* Barnabas, *and* Peter *and* Paul. Gal. 2. *tell us how far the beſt of mortals are from perfection. Our difference I think is not cauſed by contrariety of worldly Intereſts, (which yet divided even* Abraham's *family and* Lot's, *and much worſe,* Joſeph's *brethren from him) For as neither of us have any great matters of worldly wealth, but our daily bread (which is enough,) ſo I am perſwaded that he ſeeketh no ſuch thing, and I am ſure I cannot if I would, who daily expect to give up my account, and carry about me a thorn in the fleſh, enough to cure at leaſt the expectation of fleſhly and worldly pleaſure and proſperity.*

Read not therefore theſe books, as the conflict of enemies, but as the conſultation of unfeigned loving friends who fain would underſtand the truth: You ſee he abhorreth the ſilencing or perſecuting the miniſters of

England

England *for Nonconformity: Yea, and all diſaffection on ſuch accounts.*

And though I ſhew the great miſtakes in his writing, impute them not to the habitual weakneſs of his judgment; But 1 *to the badneſs of his cauſe.* 2 *To the newneſs and crudity of his thoughts about it: For though he hath been long a publick conforming Miniſter, yet it is but lately that he hath received the ſatisfaction which he here expreſſed, being before purpoſed no more to* declare *or* ſubſcribe *what he here defendeth: And new thoughts are ſeldom well digeſted.*

I ſpeak this the rather becauſe ſome ſay that he is an honeſt weak man, that hath ſhewed his good will to defend their cauſe, but was not able to do it as it will ſhortly be done by ſome greater men that are about it. *But my opinion is that his conceſſions and coming ſo near the truth doth give him ſo much advantage againſt us, that the ableſt of them that*

ſtand at a greater diſtance, are like the more to marr their matter, and aſſault us with leſs ſucceſs than he.

And I adviſe his Reader to pardon ſuch ſlips in the book which I confute, as concern not much the cauſe in hand, but are only the overſights of the well meaning Author. As when pag. 8. *he diſtributeth the* Learned Miniſtry into ſeveral degrees; *of which one is* ſuch as have no Learning, *and another ſuch as* have a little, *&c. It's eaſie to know that this was a meer overſight. And in his ſupplement* pag. 145. *when he ſaith* [God himſelf doth aſſent and conſent to the uſe of all the lyes and wickedneſſes of men and devils.] *It's like the Reader will think that he meaneth by the* uſe, *that* [men and devils uſe to lye and do wickedneſs,] *or act theſe ſins: If ſo, it were odious blaſphemy indeed: But by conference I have cauſe to believe that the Author's judgment is ſound in thoſe*

points

points; and therefore that it is but an heedleſs ſpeech, and that he meaneth no more but that [God conſenteth when lyes and wickedneſſes are committed that men make good uſe of them in eſſe cognito,] *as to repent of them or hate them or take warning to avoid the like; and that God himſelf will uſe them as* occaſions *of ſome accidental good; as ſickneſs is uſed to honour the skill of the Phyſician: And that the word* Aſſent *ſlipt in becauſe his cauſe was in his thoughts. If you ſay,* This is a ridiculous equivocation: To make ſuch uſe of the Liturgie in eſſe cognito *as to hate it, or* perſwade *from* it, no enemy will deny; *but what is that to* uſing *it? To uſe the Liturgie is to read and practiſe it, and ſo to uſe lying and wickedneſs is to lye and do wickedly: that which you call ſin* objective in eſſe cognito *is not ſin indeed, but the idea of it: but it is the real Liturgie which we muſt make a Covenant to uſe.*

Anſ. *And who can manage an ill cauſe without ſomewhat that is too like it? And who doth any thing which needeth no repentance or amendment? And who is ſo wiſe as to ſpeak wiſely at all times? Let us pity one another, and pray for a teachable mind, and long for the world of Concord in perfection. O how much harder is it to juſtifie proud Schiſmatical ſilencers and perſecutors of the juſt, than to excuſe the failings of the weak! and with how great a difference ſhall they be ſhortly judged, as ſure as there is a day of judgment to be expected! Yea, how much eaſier will it be for* Sodom *and* Gomorrah, *for* Indians *and* Americans *at that day, than for thoſe that malignantly oppreſſed men of moſt ſerious piety, and fought againſt Chriſt as by his own pretended authority, and in his name.*

THE CONTENTS OF THE following Book.

CHAP. I.

THe occaſions and reaſons of anſwering Mr. Ch's. *Book.*

CHAP. II.

Of Reordination, *Equally Sinfull with* Rebaptization *in the judgment of* Greg. M. § 1. The ordination required, *ſuppoſed the perſons were* not ordained *before.* § 3. *Mr.* Chey's. *exceptions, gloſſes,* &c. *removed.* § 4, 5.

CHAP. III.

Of the ſeveral orders of miniſters. Mr. Ch's. *triſling in the ambiguity of the word* Order noted. § 2. 3.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Biſhop's *Oath to the* Arch-Biſhop.

CHAP. V.

Of the Oath of Canonical Obedience.

CHAP. VI.

CHAP. VI.

Of the words Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt. 5 *ſorts of miſſion or commiſſion given by Chriſt to his Miniſters.*

CHAP. VII.

Mr. C's 6. *ſection anſwered.* i. e. *with* pity: *concerning thoſe words to the People.* To come forth and make their exceptions to the perſon ordained.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the damnatory clauſes in the Athanaſian *Creed.*

CHAP. IX.

About the certainty of baptized Infants ſalvation *made an* Article of faith.

Mr. C. *gives no anſwer to Mr.* B's *objections.* § 1. Biſhop of *Ely*'s judgment. § 3.

A caſe put at the conference at the *Savoy*, with Biſhop Sanderſon's *anſwer.* ibid.

Reply *to that* anſwer, *with Biſhop* Morley's *return to it, and the removal of that return.* ibid.

CHAP. X.

About coming to the Sacrament of the Lords ſupper without a full truſt in Gods mercy, and a quiet conſcience.

CHAP. XI.

Of the uſe of the Apocryphal writings *as they are impoſed by the* Calendar and Rubrick, *to be* approved of and conſented to.

CHAP. XII.

Concerning conſenting to the Impoſition of Reading the Liturgy every day.

CHAP. XIII.

About denying Chriſtian burial *to* unbaptized Infants and perſons excommunicated.

CHAP. XIV.

Touching Confirmation.

CHAP. XV.

Whether we may declare our *Conſent* that none ſhould be admitted to the Communion, till he be confirmed, or deſirous and ready to be confirmed?

CHAP. XVI.

Concerning the ſole ſponſion *of* God-Fathers *in the* Liturgie.

CHAP. XVII.

Concerning the impoſing of kneeling *at the* Lords ſupper.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the Croſs in baptiſm. *as a* Conſecrating, dedicating ſign. § 1.

Reaſons againſt it. ibid.

The ſilence of Chriſt in this matter. 2.

It ſeemeth to accuſe Chriſt's Law of imperfection. 3.

Chriſt commiſſioned not his Apoſtles *to inſtitute any new Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace.*

Whether it be made a Sacrament. § 2. *Of Gods* prohibition. 12 *Deut.* of adding or diminiſhing. § 3. *Mr. C's* Argumentum ad hominem *conſi-*

dered

dered § 4. *The antient Christians practise.* § 5. *Mr. C's objection removed.* § 6. *The meaning of the second commandment in forbidding Images.* § 7. *Mr* Cheney's *concession.* § 8. *A full explication of the nature of that sign.* § 9. *Answer to the* great Bishops *notions.* § 10. *Of the* efficacy of Sacraments, *from* Aquinas. &c. § 11. *More* objections *answered, and* cavils *removed.* § 12 &c.

CHAP. XIX.

About giving the Sacrament to all parishioners *thrice a year.*

CHAP. XX.

Of accusing those that are refused the communion within 14 *dayes. The true case of the* parish minister's power *to suspend his own act, and not give the Sacrament against his conscience in* 22 *particulars.* § 2.

CHAP. XXI.

Of the Chancellor's office. *Of Mr.* C. *thirteen parts of discipline.* § 2. *Proved to be defective.* § 3. *Objection answered.* § 4. *What power the parish minister hath in publishing an excommunication.* § 5.

CHAP. XXII.

Of the Surplice.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the Rule for finding Easter day.

CHAP. XXIV.

Concerning our Assenting, Consenting *to, and* approving *of the* many disorders and defects in the Liturgy.

CHAP. XXV.

CHAP. XXV.

Whether we may aſſent to the Preface *for juſtifying all that was in the* Book before?

CHAP. XXVI.

Whether the Act of Uniformity *be* any part of the book *to which we are* required to give our conſent?

CHAP. XXVII.

About declaring it unlawful to take arms by the Kings authority againſt any commiſſionated by him.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Of the Obligation of the Covenant *handled at large.* per tot.

CHAP. XXIX.

About the expoſition of Oaths *and Laws.*

CHAP. XXX.

Several falſe devices *of Mr.* Ch. *for* ſtretching of Subſcriptions, Covenants, and Profeſſions. *The vanity of which is diſcovered.*

CHAP. XXXI.

Mr. Cheney's concluſion evidenced *to be* a bundle of miſtakes and impertinencies.

CHAP. XXXII.

A full and clear anſwer to Mr. Ch's. ſupplement.

The ſecond part.

Mr. Cheney's Five undertakings conſidered.

1 Queſt. *Whether* it be certain by Gods word that Infants baptized dying before actual ſin be *undoubtedly* ſaved? 2 Queſt.

2 Queſt. *Whether may unconverted ones within the Church demand and receive the Lords ſupper?*

3 Queſt. *Whether a miniſter may put from the Sacrament thoſe of his pariſh who be Chriſtned People, and come to Church, and joyn in the publick worſhip, and tender themſelves to receive, being under no ſentence of Excommunication?*

4 Queſt. *Whether the common ſort of ungodly Chriſtians are to be caſt out of the Church by penal excommunication, and uſed as excommunicate ones?*

5 Queſt. *Whether Mr.* Baxter's *Doctrine and principles concerning particular Churches be ſound and good?*

The

A DEFENCE OF THE NON-CONFORMIST'S Plea for Peace, AGAINST Mr. J. CHENY, THE *Non-conforming Conformiſt.*

CHAP. I.

§ 1. DEar Brother, I have diligently read and conſidered your Book, and think it my duty to give a ſhort Account of the Effect.

I have reproved many that blame you for not telling me firſt of it, and knowing what I could ſay to it, before you ventured to publiſh it; 1. Be-

cauſe of our true Love and Acquaintance: 2. Becauſe a man ſhould be willing to try and hear the utmoſt, before he engage too deep: 3. Becauſe if you miſtake, it is many and heinous ſins that you may be guilty of, by hardening multitudes in impenitency. To which I anſwer then, 1. I conſulted not you before I wrote, and why then muſt you needs conſult me. 2. A wiſe man can conjecture what may be ſaid againſt him, without asking. 3. You might ſuſpect ſome hinderance to that which you judged a neceſſary duty. 4. You have heard and read what the Non-Conformiſts ſay, as I did what the Conformiſts ſay, without any further conſultation.

But I am moſt impatient with them that ſuſpect your intention and deſign, and do hereby profeſs to them that know you not ſo well as I do, that I do from my heart believe you to be a better man than my ſelf, of good judgment in other things, of greater meekneſs, patience, humility and ſelf-denyal; and do verily believe that your End was to promote Chriſtian Love and Concord (which was mine.) And as I wrote to cure mens uncharitable thoughts of the Non-Conformiſts; ſo did you, to cure or prevent mens thinking worſe of the Conformiſts than they do deſerve; an End that's good and neceſſary.

§ 2. But our meaſures of underſtanding are ſo various, that it is no wonder that we differ about the means: And therefore leſt I ſhould be guilty, 1. Of deſerting the Truth, and Cauſe of Righteouſneſs. 2. And of the loſs of the Plaiſter which I made to heal the ulcerated minds of the haters and reproachers, and ſilencers of them that deſerve it

not.

not. 3. And of the ſin of ſuch as be drawn by your Book to that which hath the aggravations which I named, and fear my ſelf, I ſhall take the freedom of telling you and others, my thoughts of your performance in your Book.

§ 3. I. I perceive it is not your deſign to draw any man into ſo much Conformity as will procure him allowance in the Publick approved Miniſtry: And then what the better will the Church be for his change in all the reſt, while one point of Non-conformity will keep him out as well as a hundred? For 1. You profeſs that you cannot juſtifie all, though you fain would. 2. You over-paſs ſome in your defence. 3. You call your ſelf a Non-conforming Conformiſt. 4. You are fain to fly from your Country, being an excommunicate man, and to live in a poor condition among ſtrangers, to keep out of the Goal, to avoid the Writ *de excommunicato capiendo*; and yet you lived under the Worthy and Learned Biſhop *Pearſon*, accounted one of the moſt moderate and beſt in *England*. And what good would ſo much Conformity do the Church? Can we ſerve them in a Priſon any better than Non-Conformiſts may? But let us conſider of your Defence it ſelf.

§ 4. II. You would have your Reader have my Book before him, and you profeſs to anſwer it; and yet you profeſs ſo far to lay it by your ſelf, as 1. To omit anſwering a great part of it, eſpecially which juſtifieth our Preaching and Aſſemblies (yea I think you plead for them;) and my large Anſwer to the Charge of Schiſm you ſeem to approve, which we accept, and ſo that is no part of our Controverſie;

§ 5. 2. But you also avoid the Defence of the Corporation Declaration, which is a matter of so great importance to all the Cities and Corporations of *England*, as perhaps may prove more considerable than the silencing of a thousand of the best Preachers among us for Non-conformity. But I blame you not for not doing more than you are able.

§ 6. 3. But why did you avoid the Order of my Book's Objections? and also the answering of any chief intimated reasons (while yet I did but intimate some few disclaiming argumentations?) why do you tell us, that you take them as you remember them, without the Book, and satisfie your own conscience, while you seem to answer the Book? And what drew you to begin with Reordination (which none of the Antient Non-Conformists are put upon?) But your disclaiming to defend the *Oxford*-Oath, and your profession that some part of the Subscriptions and Declarations by the Law enjoyned to Ministers, you never made your self, doth bid us to believe you, that it is to draw men *to think mildly of conscientious Conformists, that you write, if not to judge Conformity lawful, and a duty in case of silencing, &c.*] And I doubt not but you will so far prevail.

But when you tell us of a Noble man impeached of Treason, that made it his business only to put by that charge, you may remember that when the Great and Good Duke of *Somerset* had so done, and the shout was made for his being found *not guilty*, he was yet (though the King's Uncle and Protector) beheaded as a Felon: Such a justification doth little good. And you say truly

[*I am*

[*I am not to yield to the ſmalleſt Sin to ſave my Life.*]

§ 7. I ſee not how this agreeth with what you ſay, "*After that Mens weakneſs and ignorance may* "*make it their duty of two perceived Sins propoſed* "*to them, to take the ſafer ſide, and that is to* "*avoid the greater.*] *Anſw.* Doubtleſs it is a groſs Contradiction to ſay, *It is a duty to chooſe*, or not avoid the leaſt Sin: For that is no Sin which a Man is not bound to avoid; and undoubtedly when two Sins are propoſed, every Man is bound to avoid both, though not as equal with equal Zeal: And God never neceſſitateth Man to chooſe either, or not to avoid both: But if our own Badneſs diſable us from avoiding both, we muſt be moſt careful to avoid the greater. I cannot pray without ſinful dulneſs, or imperfection of Faith: But I muſt rather avoid a total Omiſſion than imperfect performance, for all the Faults are eminently in this. No Sin is to be done on pretence of avoiding a greater Sin: But ſometime the avoiding of a great Sin, may make another thing (*e.g.* the omiſſion of that which elſe would have been a Duty) to be then no Sin, that elſe would have been a Sin. Negative Commands bind *ad ſemper.*

§ 8. You ſay, "*If the Non-conformiſt err, it* "*is on many accounts a ſafe Error, becauſe it is con-* "*feſſedly a refuſal to Subſcribe and Conform to a* "*number of things in their own nature indifferent:* "*Rigid Conformiſts confeſs them to be but Triſles* "*comparatively, the Church might be without them* "*and yet do well: And Moderate Conformiſts con-* "*feſs them to be burdenſom, and the Church might* "*be and do better without them, or if they were left*

" *to each Man's choice and will.* *Answ.* But if we prove them far from indifferent, Non-conformity will prove a necessary and great Duty: However, I doubt the Imposers will give you as little thanks for this description of the Case, as they do us for Non-conformity; Specially when you add that for this, [" *We are thought Seditious, Factious,* " *Schismatical, worthy to be Silenced, Imprisoned,* " *Anathematized, and used as Intolerable.*] They will not love the Glass that sheweth them such a Face as you dislikingly describe.

Especially when you tell them that you [" *Are* " *satisfied that it is in it self a great and dreadful Sin,* " *to Silence the Non-conformists, and do by them as* " *hath been for these many Years.*] And [*Blame* " *those loose Conscienced Men, who think that their* " *Humours, Opinions, Lusts, and proud and impe-* " *rious Wills, are fit to be the standard of Unity,* " *Uniformity, and Edification to all the Churches.*] This is but cold pleading for Conformity.

CHAP. II.

§ 1. YOu begin with Reordination. And, 1*st.* I told you how the Church in all Ages hath commonly abhorred it: The Canons, called the Apostles, depose both the Ordainer that doth it, and the Ordained. *Gregory Magnus*, equalleth it with twice Baptism (which perhaps your may think lawful too) you are for it upon reason *Toties quoties.* You tell us how loth we should be as to Condemn that which so many worthy Men held as were the old Conformists: And may not

I tell you that you ſhould be more Cautelous how you contradict all Ages of the Church, even to this Day.

§ 2. Had you heard as great a Man as I have done, declare that he could not take them for Miniſters, or take the Sacrament of them that had not Epiſcopal Ordination; and had you heard my L. Chancellor *Hide* give ſuch Reaſons openly for Reordination as I did; and had you ſeen the Writings of ſo Learned a Biſhop as I have ſeen, to prove ſuch no Miniſters as are Ordained but by *Presbyters*, and heard ſuch Men, and ſo many Argue for it as I have done, you could not have thought that the judgment of thoſe that impoſe Reordination, was, or is, that Men are true Miniſters of Chriſt that are Ordained by *Presbyters* only? So that your ſenſe of the Impoſition is feigned.

§ 3. *It* is a known thing that the Church of *England* is not of your ſingular opinion for Reordination: You may as well feign them to be for Rebaptizing: They all renounce it with our Conſent: Therefore they that require Men to be Ordained by Biſhops, muſt needs hold that they had no true Ordination before; or elſe they ſhould be for that which they abhor. So that it's paſt doubt, you talk of you know not what, when you make this to be but the ſingular Opinion of one Mr. *Dodwel*, diſowned by all; though much in his Book beſides, be by moſt diſowned: And it is not every later Biſhop that made the Law, or altered the Liturgy,

§ 4. You ſay that [" *Ordination once validly* " *done by eminent* Presbyters, *and grave ſubſtan-*

" *tial Miniſters, it doth to all intents and purpoſes* " *make him a compleat Miniſter.*] And elſewhere you maintain the Validity of *Presbyters* Ordination: and ſay, " *That it is a taking God's Name in* " *vain, when it is done without urgent Reaſons.*] I have moved to you, that the preſent Impoſers ſuppoſe the contrary, (and I think, conſidering how much the King and Parliament left to the judgment of the Convocation) the preſent Settlement proveth what was the Convocations judgment, who are the preſent Church of *England*'s repreſentative.) They that are againſt Reordaining, and yet call men to be ordained, certainly judge them unordained before: And you are to take your Ordination, and ſpeak the words in the known ſenſe of the Impoſers; or elſe you equivocate: And what Reaſons have you to deceive them? At leaſt it is notorious ſcandal to ſeem to do it in an ill ſenſe. And when you pretend that your Miniſtry elſe muſt be forſaken, we ſay, No: It is but to ſave you from ſuffering for your Miniſtration, as long as you can uſe it on ſuffering terms: And you have not eſcaped ſuffering, nor ſaved your Miniſtry by Conforming. If you would rather ſuffer, than not Preach to Non-Conformiſts when you had an allowed Church of Conformiſts, ſhould not we rather ſuffer than by our Reordination ſubmit to that which is the Churches or Laws publick profeſſing that we were no Ordained Miniſters of Chriſt before? when after that we have never the more liberty for our Miniſtry, unleſs we conform to all the reſt. I remember three Worthy men reordained one fourteen, and two ſeventeen years ago, that had never the more liberty to Preach.

§ 5.

§ 5. You ſay that [" *Ordination by eminent and* " *Senior Presbyters is Epiſcopal Ordination, though* " *not in the vulgar ſenſe. For a Biſhop and Preſ-* " *byter in the ſenſe of Scripture are the ſame.*] *Anſ.* Remember this when you ſubſcribe to the diſtinction of Order. And I believe you cannot name two Biſhops in *England* (if one) that had a Vote in Parliament and Convocation for making the impoſing Laws that were of your mind: Nor two that will now ſay, that it is lawful to be twice ordained Presbyter: And remember 1. That it is the Act of Uniformity that requireth this laſt Ordination. 2. That the Biſhop of *London*, of *Lincoln*, of *Hereford*, came into their places ſince; and were none of the Legiſlators.

§ 6. You ſay [" *If the Presbyters excel thoſe Bi-* " *ſhops, Ordination by them is more excellent than* " *by theſe.*] *Anſ.* And yet can you aſſert that they are diſtinct Orders, when the Power of Ordaining is made the chief part of the Biſhops Order? I that am againſt you ſtick at this ſomewhat more than you, when the Law and Canon make the Biſhop of the *Quorum*. And as I was ordained by a Biſhop; ſo I never joyned with Presbyters in ordaining any man, nor did venture to lay hands on any in an Ordination.

CHAP. III.

§ 1. YOur ſecond Section is of our Aſſent to the words in the Book of Ordination of the Notoreity of the Antiquity of the three diſtinct Orders. And 1. You juſtifie it by telling us that

[*difference*

[*difference of Holineſs, Wiſdom, Uſefulneſs may be ſaid to make different Orders.*] But this is too luſory in a ſerious buſineſs. Words of Art or Science are to be underſtood according to the uſe of the men of that *Art* or *Science*: And the many old School Diſputes, and Controverſal Writers tell us long ago, how they underſtood the word [*Orders*] as Offices in *Specie* differing from *Degrees* in the ſame *Species*. In your equivocal ſenſe you ſay true, that there are more than three Orders, or threeſcore: Yea, in the uſual ſenſe of old they had ſeven Orders, and yet they held Biſhops and Presbyters to be but one of the ſeven; as I ſhewed you out of *Spelman* in *Ælfrick*'s Canons of this Church of *England*, in the very times of Popery.

§ 2. You ſay you make it not an Article of your Faith, that this ſenſe of Epiſcopacy is evident to all men that diligently read Scripture and Antient Writers.] But the queſtion is, Whether you *Aſſent to it*, (or more?) If not, how can you ſay you do? The Biſhop of *Hereford* in *Naked Truth* hath given you ſome reaſons of diſſent, and Biſhop *Uſher*, and many ſuch have done ſo before him.

§ 3. Whether you hit their ſenſe or not, gather by what I ſaid to your former Point of Re-ordaining.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

§ 1. YOU next chooſe to ſpeak of our Aſſent and Conſent to the Biſhop's Oath [*to ſubject himſelf in obedience to the Arch-Biſhop, and to his Seat or Metropolitan Church, and to his Succeſſors.*] And you tell us that all men are bound to ſubject themſelves one to another: This again is too groſs equivocating. Do you believe that this is the *Species* of ſubjection, which is meant in the Book and Oath?

§ 2. You better tell us, that being *Epiſcopus primæ ſedis, he may be reverenced as the Fore-man of a Jury.*] But is this *obeying* him, and his Church and Succeſſors? Is not this alſo Equivocation? Do they ſwear Obedience to the Fore-man and his Succeſſors?]

§ 3. Your beſt anſwer is, *It is enjoyned by Authority.*] And if it were but obeying them in Civils, or *circa ſacra*, in matters determinable by the King; this anſwer had much in it: But when it is intended to be in the exerciſe of the Word, and Keys, and Matters which Chriſt hath predetermined, thoſe Non-Conformiſts that are not for the Divine Right of Arch-Biſhops, cannot aſſent and conſent to it: And thoſe of them that are for it, do (with you) hold that there ſhould be Parochial Biſhops, or to every Church; and that thoſe that you call Dioceſans are indeed Arch-Biſhops: And they are not for Arch-Biſhops over Arch-Biſhops, leſt it lead you to a Pope, (as he was in the Empire at leaſt.)

§ 4. And Succeſſions ſo often prove unhappy, that

that we like not ſetting up one Church over another to the end of the world, when we cannot juſtifie it at all. They that are (contrary to the *Carthage* Fathers) for a Biſhop of Biſhops, would yet have him their Ruler but as an Arch-Biſhop, as General Officers in an Army over the Colonels, but not that our Church ſhall be ſet over many others; much leſs to ſwear to unknown Succeſſors.

§ 5. And I told you divers old Councils condemned Biſhops ſwearing inferiours to them, as the cauſe of many miſchiefs; and ſad experience taught them to make that Canon.

CHAP. V.

§ 1. NExt you ſpeak of the Oath or Covenant of Canonical Obedience: And you 1. Doubt whether it be an Oath. In the Act of Ordination it is but a Covenant: But (what they do now) I know not; but heretofore it was alſo impoſed as an Oath. You tell me of my Conceſſions: I grant that ſo far as they exerciſe but ſuch power as belongeth to Officers of the King, we may obey him in covenanting to obey them. But it is in the exerciſe of the Keys proper to Chriſt's ſpecial Officers, that the Book meaneth, which you aſſent to; even in matters of ſacred Guidance, Excommunication and Abſolution. And you ſay nothing to ſatisfie 1. Thoſe that are under obtruded and unlawful Biſhops, that come in ſo contrary to Chriſt's and the Old Churches Order, as that the Old Canons decree them to be no Biſhops; 2. Nor to ſatisfie thoſe that think Chancellors uſe of

of the Keys to be unlawful. 3. Nor thoſe that think that *Officials*, *Surrogates*, *Commiſſaries*, *Arch-Deacons*, being no Biſhops, have no juſt power but what the King may give them, and not a ſuperior Power of the Keys (ſee Dr. *Hammond*'s Explication of it.)

§ 2. But after you think that none but the Biſhop is the *Ordinary*; but the Church-Laws and common uſe contradict you, and call all theſe, when Judges of the Court, your *Ordinaries*.

§ 3. And I told you (which you paſs over) that this is condemned by the Decrees of Antient Councils as a miſchievous thing.

§ 4. You ſay, *It binds us not to obey the Canons, elſe the Oath of Allegiance would bind us to it, and all the Statute-Laws.*] *Anſw.* This hath more ſeeming ſtrength than the reſt. But 1. If it did hold, it removeth but one branch of the difficulty. 2. And indeed he that ſweareth Obedience to the King, doth ſwear to obey him according to the Law: And ſo he that ſweareth Obedience to the Biſhop, may mean more, and include Mandates; but he cannot reaſonably mean leſs, and exclude the Governing Laws. But yet as we never meant that the King's Laws are all blameleſs, or that we will obey them if they command us to ſin againſt God, but only will ſhew our ſubmiſſion by ſuffering: So I confeſs our Oath to Biſhops, as ſuch, can mean no more. But then, were I under a King, whoſe very frame of Laws were unlawful, as tending to extirpate Piety, I ſhould doubt whether I might ſimply ſwear to obey him as my Governor. How far the Canons are more unmeet inſtruments for true Church-Government than our Laws

are

are for Civil Government, I will not here enquire.

CHAP. VI.

§ 1. YOur fifth Section is about the words [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.] in Ordination.

1. Two things you include in the ſenſe: 1. *Inward Qualifications.* 2. *Inveſtiture.* But I told you 1. Inward Qualifications are preſuppoſed, and the perſon examined accordingly. 2. I never heard or knew of any that received them by Ordination. 3. By Inveſtiture it is the Miniſterial Office that is given them: To none of this do you anſwer.

But you ſay, Chriſt uſed the words, and no extraordinary thing then conferred, *&c.*] *Anſ.* 1. If Chriſt intended their after-reception of the Holy Ghoſt at *Pentecoſt*, it followeth not that we muſt uſe ſuch words, that can promiſe or give no ſuch ſpirit. 2. There were five ſeveral ſorts of Miſſion or Commiſſion then given to Chriſt's Miniſters.

1. Chriſt ſent out the twelve and ſeventy temporarily to Preach, do Miracles, and return; and gifted and bleſſed them accordingly.

2. He choſe twelve as related to the number of the Tribes, and ordained them ſtated Apoſtles to the Jews, or Circumciſion; and he qualified them accordingly by his Spirit.

3. He ordained them Apoſtles to all the world (indefinitely) and accordingly renewed their Commiſſion: For this he qualified them with ordinary gifts of his Spirit initially now at his reſurrection, together with their new Commiſſion, and more fully

fully and miraculouſly at *Pentecoſt*: You know how ignorant the Apoſtles were of Chriſt's Death, Sacrifice, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, *&c.* till he was riſen: And then Chriſt opened their underſtandings in theſe Articles, and gave more Faith (and anſwerably we muſt conceive other grace was given) than they had before. This cannot be denyed: And is not this giving of the Holy Ghoſt more than man muſt now pretend to imitate?

4. Beſides theſe, there were after-miſſions of particular Apoſtles (as *Paul* and *Barnabas*) or particular meſſages in particular Provinces.

5. And there was the Ordaining of Biſhops or Elders as fixed Guides of particular Churches: And theſe being ordinary Officers, were ordinarily to be qualified before they were ordained, and not to receive their Abilities by their Ordination: And this is the Ordination that we have to do with.

CHAP. VII.

§ 1. YOur ſixth Section requireth pity, rather than reply: The Church that a Biſhop is ordained to, is many hundred Pariſhes; the Biſhop of *Lincoln* hath many Counties. You know by whom the Biſhops are Choſen, and where Conſecrated: The words were originally uſed to the Church over which the Biſhop was placed. And is it ſerious dealing to ſend word to none of them of your Time, or Place, and then call to Men in a Church in *London*, or a private Chappel, to come forth and ſpeak their Exceptions? If you

can

can prove that this may be Aſſented and Conſented to, you have a ſtronger proving Faculty than I have.

CHAP, VIII.

§ 1. I See nothing ſatisfactory to the Objections which I made about the Damnatory Paſſages in *Athanaſius*'s Creed. And I had reference much to a Manuſcript, in which Mr. *Dodwel* is the Objector, and the Biſhop of *Lincoln* ſuppoſed the Anſwerer; which he doth with great Learning and Impartiality. But to his Argument, That we are not to Aſſent to the truth of the Paſſages excepted againſt, becauſe we read the *Apocrypha*, and yet the Church intendeth not to bind us to believe ſome Untruths in it (which he nameth;) I Anſwered, that *Athanaſius*'s Creed is part of the Book which we muſt aſſent to, but the *Apocrypha* is not. I make leſs my ſelf of this Scruple than the reſt, becauſe I have reaſon to believe *Athanaſius* meant it well; when I have not the ſame aſſurance of the meaning of the Authors of ſome late Impoſitions.

CHAP. IX.

§. 1. YOur Sect. 8, about the certainty of Baptized Infants Salvation, being made here an Article of Faith, I have much more to ſay againſt: But you anſwer not to any of the ſtrength of my Objections. 1. And

1. And how ſtrange is it that you ſaw a Manuſcript of Biſhop *Uſher's*, telling us of [*this Clauſe coming ſurreptitiouſly into the Book*,] whereas he was Dead two Years before the Book was altered, or that Clauſe put in? Indeed, there was another in that ſounded almoſt like it, which meant no more than that [*A Baptized Child hath all that is neceſſary to Salvation*,] ſuppoſing his right, (*ex parte Eccleſiæ*) *though he die without Confirmation, or the Euchariſt*, which were formerly given to Infants: But this never ſaid what the new Article ſaith.

§ 2. You ſay, many Conformiſts ſay, *It is no part of Aſſent and Conſent, becauſe it is not uſed as part of the Church Service, and they ſubſcribe to no more.*] *Anſw.* Name not thoſe Conformiſts, leſt you Diſhonour them. Do they declare their Aſſent to all things contained in the Book, and mean only the Service which they muſt ſay? Or do they [*Conſent to the uſe of all*,] and take an Article of Faith to be put in for no uſe? Intreat them not to take the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, with that Latitude and Exceptiouſneſs.

§ 3. You ſay, you can Aſſent to it in a ſound ſenſe: And [*it's more than you can prove that all Infants are ſaved, but all that have right before God are ſaved, but not thoſe that have no right before God.* *Anſw.* 1. But you were told that the Church ſignifies her ſenſe by the Canons, which forbid the Miniſter (on Penalty) to refuſe any Child, that hath God-Fathers, not excepting *Pagans, Infidels, Atheiſts*, or *Apoſtates*: Why did you not anſwer that?

2. A Right before God, ſignifies either properly to be a Child that is under the promiſe of Par-

don, in the ſenſe of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.*] And of ſuch I am of your mind. Or elſe it ſignifieth only one that the Miniſter hath, *Coram Deo*, a right to Baptize. And ſo he hath as to any adult Atheiſt, or Heathen (or his Child) if he deceitfully profeſs Chriſtianity. I ſuppoſe you ſpeak in the firſt proper ſenſe.

But if you think that the ſenſe of the Rubrick you are miſtaken. No one knoweth better than Biſhop *Gunning*, and he will tell you otherwiſe, *viz.* That God's merciful Covenant giveth us Right to bring any Child in the World to be Baptized for Salvation, as it giveth any Man right to take in an expoſed Orphan into his Houſe. And if the Sponſor were to become Proprietor, and take the Child for his own (as *Abraham* Circumciſed the Children born in his Houſe) I would not diſpute againſt it, though I were in doubt: But I have proved to you that the Liturgy, or Canon, oblige the Sponſor to no ſuch thing, nor are they to profeſs it: and you your ſelf ſuppoſe the contrary, that the Parent is the Firſt Covenanter: This Rubrick then ſpeaketh of any Child, and you limit it to the Seed of the Faithful, and ſo Equivocate. At our Conference at the *Savoy*, 1661. before the Biſhops, I put this true Caſe; [I have in my Pariſh a profeſt Infidel, that derideth openly the Scripture, and the Life to come; but for faſhion ſaith beforehand, *I will bring my Child to be Baptized, and ſay as the Book requireth, and refuſe my Child if you dare.*] The Reverend Biſhop *Sanderſon* was in the *Chair*, and anſwered me, none of them contradicting, That if I Baptized him

him according to the Church of *England* that requireth God-Fathers, I need not ſcruple it. I askt him, By whom that Child had right more than any other Heathen's Child? Seeing, 1. The God-Father is oft as bad as the Parents. 2. And the God-Father taketh not the Child as a Proprietor for his own. Biſhop *Morley* anſwers, That he knew ſome that did take them, and Educate them as their own. I anſwered, 1. The Canon, or Rubrick, require it not. 2. I never knew one Man yet that did it, or that ever thought that as a Sponſor, he was obliged ſo to do. 3. If it were otherwiſe; Poor Mens Children could get no God-Fathers, and Rich Men would have none. And what's this then to the ſenſe of the Article in queſtion, that ſpeaks of all Baptized Children? (It being of the Baptized *quâ tales*, and an *indefinite in re neceſſaria.*) You dare profeſs that *of all*, and *undoubtedly certain by the Word of God*, which you think is---- true but of thoſe that have *right before God.* And may not one profeſs any thing at that Rate?

Beſides, I that know why the old words were changed into theſe, and by whom it was brought in, urged and procured, am fully ſatisfied of the ſenſe of them that did it, by experience.

Your Expoſition of the Doctrine of Baptiſm here adjoyned, is very ſound and good. As to your *Catholicon* which gets down all, I may cauſe you to caſt it up anon.

CHAP. X.

§ 1. YOur 9th Section, about not coming to the Sacrament without a full truſt in God's Mercy and a quiet Conſcience, tells us what the Impoſure *ſhould have ſaid*, when I only except againſt what they *have ſaid*. The Caſe is ſo groſs, I am apt to think they meant as you ſay; eſpecially when I conſider that thoſe muſt be Ruined that have not a *quiet Conſcience*, if they will not, or dare not Communicate. But if well meaning Men put me to aſſent to words of a contrary ſignification in the common uſe, I had rather approve their good meanings, than their impoſed words, through overſight ſo expreſſed.

CHAP. XI.

§ 1. ABout the uſe of the *Apocrypha*, you quite miſtook the Queſtion: It was not chiefly whether you may uſe or read it, but whether you may approve and conſent to the Calendar and Rubrick which impoſeth it, to be read; yea, thoſe Books of *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Bell and the Dragon*, &c. If you ſay that you Conſent not to the Calendar and Rubrick, I ask, 1. Is it not *contained in* the Book? 2. Is it of no uſe, when the uſe is named in the Preface? Cannot we thus ſay any thing required, and mean what we liſt by it? Teach not the *Papiſts* to take the impoſed Teſt and Oaths at ſuch a rate as this.

§ 2. You

§ 2. You ſay, It is not on Lords Days. *Anſw.* On the Week Days God muſt be Worſhipped purely, and according to his Will.

§ 3. You ſay, *It's more than you can prove that any thing is falſe.* Why did you not anſwer the two Inſtances which I gave out of the Biſhop of *Lincoln*'s excellent *Manuſcript*? And how much may you find in Dr. *Jo. Reynolds*, and many other *Proteſtants* againſt the *Papiſts*?

§ 4. You ſay, *If any thing be Fabulous, it may be read as an inſtructive Parable, ſome cite Æſop's Fables.*] *Anſw.* But dare you conſent to the reading and impoſing of *Æſop*'s Fables, or any other, to be read in ſtead of God's Word, under the ſame name of Leſſons, ſo many days in the Publick Worſhip?

CHAP. XII.

YOur 11th Section ſaith no more, but that you ſee nothing but one may Conſent to the impoſed reading of the Liturgy every day to ſave his Liberty. *Anſ.* 1. I gave you a reaſon againſt Covenanting ſo to uſe it every Day, which you anſwer not. And. 2. Why took you no notice that it is the Books Impoſition of this, which you muſt conſent to, and not only the Practice? Is not the impoſing Precept [*contained in the Book*] yea, and is it of *no uſe*?

3. And why do ſo few Conformiſts ſo uſe it?

CHAP. XIII.

§ 1. IN your 12th Section you joyn ſeveral things.

1. About denying Chriſtian Burial to the Unbaptized Infants, and the Excommunicate, as not ſignifying their Damnation. But if you take in the foreſaid Rubrick Articles that pronounceth certain Salvation to them if Baptized, you may ſee what is like to be the meaning of the Church here: And alſo if you read, how they uſe to expound their Anathema, or Major Excommunication; and on what account it is often made. Doctor *Heylin* tells you, That the neceſſity of Baptiſm was one of Biſhop *Laud*'s firſt Theſis's publickly maintained in *Oxford*. You are now Excommucate your ſelf, but not with that Anathema which is of the hardeſt ſignification. But this is little to my objected Caſe.

2. But the doubt is about the words, that in ſenſe pronounce all others that are Buried in *England*, ſaved. And you would make us believe that the Rubrick, which excepteth the Excommunicate and the other two ſorts only, meaneth alſo the excepting of the *Excommunicable*, or *Notorious* wicked Men. But by ſuch ſtretches what words may not *Proteſtant* or *Papiſt* take by an Expoſition of his own making? If three ſorts excepted limit you not from excepting more; What can do it? I have tried the ſenſe of the moſt Leading Man in theſe Liturgick Changes that I know, whether he would conſent that the words ſhould

be

be further extended to except the *Excommunicable*, or *Notoriously Flagitious*; and he moſt contemptuouſly rejected it, as if it would leave power to every *Presbyter* to Damn whom he would (and to Excommunicate Men after Death) without a Biſhop.

3. But you will prove your feigned Senſe to be right, becauſe the *Canon* 68. ſaith, [*If the party Deceaſed were denounced Excommunicate* (*Majore Excommunicatione*) *for ſome grievous and notorious Crime, and no Man able to teſtifie of his Repentance, the Prayers are not to be ſaid at his Burial.*] *Anſ.* Could you have more evidently confuted your ſelf? The Church alloweth you, yea, requireth you to forbear the ſaid Prayers, 1. If it be a notorious Sinner. 2. Excommunicated. 3. And that (*Majore Excommunicatione.*) 4. And there be no proof of his Repentance. And hence you can infer, That the Church meant it alſo of *Notorious Sinners not Excommunicate.* What Alchimy is this? Whereas the Church is herein ſpecially careful that the Prieſt may not be the Judge: What need the *Major Excommunication* be put in, if it were not meant? The Canon here declareth the Churches Senſe more obligingly, than any Biſhop can do.

CHAP. XIV.

§ 1. WHat you ſay of the whole ſubſtance of Confirmation referred to the Pariſh Paſtor, the Ceremony only reſerved to the Biſhop, is all without Book, and a meer miſtake, as

the Biſhops will ſoon tell you, and common experience. Had you heard what the Biſhops at *Worceſter*-Houſe before the King and Lords ſaid againſt inſerting into the King's Declaration of Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, that one word [*Conſent*] *viz.* the Miniſter's *Conſent* to the confirming of thoſe of his Flock, and how it after came in; you would not have talkt at this rate of *our Conſent.*

CHAP. XV.

§ 1. YOur fourteenth Section is of the doubt [*Whether we may Declare our Conſent that none ſhould be admitted to the Communion, till he be confirmed, or deſirous and ready to be confirmed?*]

To this 1. You ſay of your own head, *That Confirmation is not intended for them that have been already admitted to the Lord's Table*;] without any proof, though clean contrary to your Covenant of Conformity. The words are, That ["*None are to be* "*admitted till*,&c.] And you ſay, That by [*None*] is meant [*None except all that have been ſo already admitted, that is, moſt of the Communicants by far in* England, *and all that come out of* France, Holland, Scotland,*&c.*] What a great limitation hath this [*None?*] *None except almoſt all, or moſt.*

Bocealine tells us of a device at *Rome* to make a man's throat ſwallow a Pompion; and then no doubt any Phyſician may procure the ſwallowing of a Pill.

§ 2. But you are *perſwaded you ſhall not meet with one perſon that will not deſire it rather than be put from the Sacrament.*

Anſ. 1.

Anſ. 1. But it is not your *own practice* only that you muſt profeſs conſent to, but to the *Uſe of the Rubrick*, as it is a Law to all others: Do you think no other ſhall meet with ſuch, becauſe *you* may not?

2. Remember that the Confirmation in queſtion is little kin to that which I and Mr. *Hanmer* have written for: A very Learned Biſhop told me lately, that it is for the giving of the Holy Ghoſt by Impoſition of hands: And (whatever you feign) it is confined to the *Order* of Biſhops. Do you know what *Dallæus de Confirmat.* hath ſaid againſt it? And that all are againſt it as with us that are againſt Dioceſan Prelacy? I know few Non-Conformiſts in *England*, that are for it, or deſire it. When I pleaded for it in 1660. hoping to have reduced the Engliſh Confirmation to that which I deſcribed in my *Treatiſe of Confirmation*, had you but heard how much the truly Learned, judicious, honeſt Dr. *Wallis* ſaid againſt it, who is a publick Profeſſor in *Oxford*, a Conformiſt, and the King's Chaplain, you would not think that you ſhall never meet with any that will not deſire it, *&c.*

3. I think moſt of *England* are unconfirmed; if they deſire it, what keepeth them from it?

4. They may not deſire it, and yet not be kept from the Sacrament: For he that receiveth it not of you, or any Conformiſts, may receive it of others: And all the Conformiſts that ever I ſaw deliver the Sacrament, give it to the unconfirmed, and never ask them whether they deſire it. And yet you muſt covenant not to give it to any ſuch as deſire not Confirmation and Conſent that this be impoſed on all others.

§ 3. But you ſay, *Such a remote poſſibility ſhall not*

not keep you from Conformity.] That is, *You will Conſent to the Uſe of this Rubrick*, which requireth, that none in *England* give the Sacrament to any that deſire not our Epiſcopal Confirmation, which almoſt all the Non-Conformiſts deſire not; and moſt of *England* ſhew by their practice, that they deſire not, becauſe you conceit that you ſhall meet with none ſuch your ſelf, who perhaps may never adminiſter the Sacrament, (at leaſt till you are abſolved from your Excommunication.) And yet you are ſo honeſtly againſt Diviſion, that you will not ſeparate from the Non-Conformiſts, and their Aſſemblies, though you ſuffer for it. Theſe things hang not well together.

CHAP. XVI.

§ 1. YOur 15th Section is againſt my greateſt Objection; the manner of baptizing by God-fathers ſole ſponſion, in the Liturgy: Where you take your own Order, and not mine (to ſatiſfie your ſelf,) and put four queſtions, and overlook the main, or ſay as good as nothing to it. My firſt queſtion is, Which way the Child cometh to have right to Baptiſm, any more than all the Infidels Children in the world? That is, *Whether the meer Sponſion of God-fathers who adopt not the Child, nor take him for their own, nor are at all required to do ſo, do give or prove a Right to Baptiſm (and conſequently to undoubted Salvation or pardon) in all the Infants of Apoſtates, Sadduces, Infidels, Brutiſts, Arrians, Socinians, Wicked men, Atheiſts*; yea or of any other? I told you how Con-

Conformiſts and other Divines here differ; but you eaſily paſs by the difficulty.

2. And the next queſtion is, Whether the Church of *England* require any ground of title in the Infant beſides the Sponſion of the fore-deſcribed God-fathers, and God's general Promiſe? And I have proved that they do not: It is not the Parents Chriſtianity or Faith that they require, nor the Grandfathers, nor any Pro-parents, or Adopters or Proprietors. Nor do they ask, *Whoſe Child it is?* but forbid us to refuſe any that have God-fathers; nor do they ſuffer the Parent to be one of the God-fathers, but forbid him ſo much as to ſpeak there, as dedicating his own Child to God, and forbid us to urge him to be preſent: Yet are they utterly diſagreed of the Child's title: Some ſay it is from God's Covenant only, and that all Children on Earth have title, and want but one to offer them to Baptiſm, as he may take in an expoſed Orphan. Some ſay that the *God-fathers* Act is his *Title* to Baptiſm. Some ſay, it is the Churches Faith. And by the *Church* ſome mean the *Miniſters*; ſome mean that Pariſh; ſome mean the Dioceſan Church; ſome the National Church; and ſome the Univerſal Church: But you ſeem to think the title is from the Parent, but you ſpeak it not out, nor much meddle with the caſe; and the Church ſeemeth not to be of that mind; though St. *Paul* ſay [*Elſe were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.*]

§ 2. But you ſay, *The Parent is not excluded nor forbid to be preſent.*] *Anſ.* But 1. No man in the Town is forbid to be preſent: Doth it follow that any man giveth title to the Child who may but be

be preſent if he will? If the Parents Faith were thought neceſſary to the Title (or a Pro-parents) the Book would require it, and require the Miniſter to take account of it, or at leaſt would ſuffer the Parent to be one of the Sponſors, or to ſpeak one word of Sponſion, all which is expreſly forbidden by the Canon, and by the Book appropriated to others.

§ 3. But you ſay, *If he will he may profeſs and Covenant for his Child, yea, the Miniſter may and ought to urge and require him.*] *Anſ.* What, and yet Conform? When he is forbid, and the Miniſter forbid to ſuffer it?

§ 4. But ſay you, [*"The Canon is no part of the Liturgy, nor are we bound to it wherein it is againſt the Liturgy and good Order.*]

Anſ. 1. By the Can. 36. we are all to ſubſcribe to uſe no other form in Adminiſtring the Sacraments but the Liturgy: And you ſhall be no Miniſter here if you ſubſcribe not to that Canon, though you ſhould ſay, *It is againſt good Order.* 2. The Liturgy it ſelf appropriateth the whole Sponſion to the God-Fathers. 3. Our queſtion is of the Churches ſenſe herein: And it is the ſame Church that made the Canons; and ſtill owneth them: Therefore in the Canon the Church expoundeth her ſenſe, more obligingly than you, or any Biſhop can expound it. So that for you to aſſent and conſent to the form of Baptiſm in the Churches ſenſe, and when you have done, to ſay that you may and muſt go againſt it, becauſe the Canon binds not, is a method of Conforming, which I will not follow you in.

§ 5. What you tell me of my Deciſion in my Directory, is nothing to our preſent Caſe. But

But you ſay, *The Canon ſuppoſeth the Parents as preſent, or Conſenting and Principal, for he procureth the God-Fathers, and the Sureties are his Deputies, or Seconds, and yet undertakes not the Parents duty.*]

Anſ. I have proved to you that the Canon, or Church, neither foundeth the Title in the Parent, nor permitteth him any Sponſion; and profeſſedly layeth it all on the God-Fathers, ſaying, *That it is by that the Child believeth, and promiſeth, performeth*, &c. And no ſuch word of the Parents Faith: Nay, all Children of Infidels or Atheiſts, muſt be thus Baptized. This therefore is your meer diſproved Fiction.

Secondly, That the Parent muſt procure the God-Fathers, no way proveth that he is ſuppoſed to be a Chriſtian or Conſent, or that he is the Principal Sponſor: For it is for the Child's ſake, that the Law bindeth him to get Sponſors, and all Atheiſts and Infidels among us, are bound to ſend their Children with Sponſors to be Baptized as well as Chriſtians.

§ 6. You ſay, *The Sureties undertake not to do the Duties of a Parent, nor more than they can do*, &c.] *Anſ.* Then it is not undertaken at all: For all that is to be undertaken is by them, and nothing at all required of the Parents.

§ 7. As to the Interrogatories, and Profeſſion, that the Child is ſaid to *Repent*, *Believe*, *forſake the Devil*, *Conſent*, &c. and not only to be the *Child* of one that *Repenteth*, *Believeth* (which is his Title) you ſay it is but to *oblige* the *Infant*: But profeſſing to *Believe* and *Repent* at preſent, and promiſing to do it hereafter, are different things.

But

But you say, *These words may be submitted to till better may be had.*] *Ans.* And why may you not say so of any Untruth? But the question is, whether they may be *Consented* to, and approved?

§ 8. As to the great Question, [*Whether it be the Intention of the Book that we deny Baptism to such as cannot procure God-Fathers, and God-Mothers, or to such as out of Conscience scruple and refuse to procure them, and will stand as Undertakers themselves.*] You say, *No surely.*

Ans. Alas, how little know you what the Conformity is which you defend? 1. Are not all Ministers to subscribe to Administer the Sacraments in no other Form than the Liturgy? *Canon* 36. 2. Doth not the Liturgy make the God-Fathers Office necessary? and a great part of the Baptismal Office is the Ministers Speech to them and their Answer, and the Charge laid on them. Can you say all these words if no Sponsor be there? Or can you have such Answers? 3. Doth not the Church Command that *no Parent be God-Father to his own Child*, and no Questions or Answers be used but the words of the Liturgy? 4. And did you ever know a Child Baptized without any Sponsor? You rightly call your self *The Non-conforming Conformist*; for you plead for it and against it, in the same Lines? Your contradiction meeteth through all your Book.

§ 9. You add, [" *If it be lawful to violate a* " *Divine Command to save the life of a Beast* (*the* " *Sabbath*) *sure it is lawful to violate a Humane* " *Rule, or Order, rather than cast Infants out of* " *the Church, and deny them Christian Baptism.*] *Ans.* It is so: And therefore it is unlawful to Con-

sent

ſent to that which I muſt not do, and to Covenant to uſe that which I muſt not uſe. If I muſt not obey it, I muſt not Covenant to obey it.

But perhaps you mean that the Law-makers intended, that in ſuch caſes the Miniſters have leave to violate it, and admit Men to the Communion that will not have God-Fathers, for God intended ſuch liberty in his Law.

Anſ. God's Law was not violated by *David*, the Prieſts, or the Diſciples, in the inſtanced caſes of the Sabbath: For he never forbad them what they did in thoſe Circumſtances: Yea, his Law had been violated [*I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*] had they done otherwiſe; and he hath no Contradictory Laws: It is ſaid that the Prieſts in the Temple brake the Sabbath and are *blameleſs*, that is, They violate materially the outward reſt of the Sabbath, but they violate not God's Law; elſe they were not blameleſs. But you can prove no ſuch things by the Church Laws in queſtion, as that Miniſters may break them by admitting ſuch Perſons to the Sacrament as it excludeth. For, 1. You Covenant to Adminiſter only according to the Liturgy. 2. The Canon puniſheth all Miniſters that give it againſt the Prohibition. 3. And the Rubrick excludeth your ſuppoſed power of Diſpenſation. Can you believe your ſelf that the meaning of the Liturgy and Canon is [*None ſhall be admitted that deſire not God-Fathers, except ſuch as will not out of an Erring Conſcience?*]

Are thoſe then admitted, that through *Prophaneneſs deſire not God-Fathers?* If ſo, then you make the ſenſe to be [*Thoſe that have not God-Fathers*

Fathers ſhall not be admitted to that Sacrament, except all that will not, viz. *Conſciencioufly, or Prophanely.*] If not, then the ſenſe muſt be [*You ſhall admit none to that Sacrament that have no God-Fathers, through Parents Prophaneneſs, but all that have none through ſcruple of Conſcience.*] And who cannot pretend ſuch ſcruple? And who will not pretend it, when that will juſtifie them? And how would the Biſhops reproach ſuch an Expoſition, which either maketh every Prieſt a judge of Mens Hearts, (whether their pretence be true or not) or elſe admitteth all that will not have God-Fathers, while the admiſſion of any of them is expreſly forbidden? It is a ſtretching Expoſition indeed which is againſt the whole form of the Office, and the expreſs words of the Churches Canon, [*No Parent ſhall be God-Father to his own Child.*] Try whether any two Biſhops in *England* will allow you any ſuch Expoſition.

If ſuch be allowed in this Caſe, why not in all other like it? And ſo the meaning of Law, Canons, and Rubrick be, [You ſhall do thus except when you have Moral Reaſon againſt it, ſuch as is Mercy, which muſt be preferred.] Do you know how many have been Fined and ſent to Goal for Preaching, though they pleaded for it Mercy to Mens Souls? Do you believe that it was the meaning of the Parliament and Biſhops, [You ſhall keep no Conventicles, nor omit the Liturgy or Ceremonies, or Subſcription, *&c.* unleſs when *Mercy* is to be preferred?] They that have Auditors that cannot bear the Liturgy, when they omit it in mercy to the Flock. I pray you get us an authentick ſignification of this Senſe.

The

The words cited by you in the Preface to the Articles of 1604. are impertinent to our buſineſs: It followeth not that you have leave to break the Laws when you think mercy requireth it, becauſe "*they are not equivalent to the Eternal Word of God,* "*nor bind conſcience as of neceſſity in the nature of* "*them, conſidered in themſelves*] and not in the Authority of the Commander. Again I ask, Shall any man eſcape puniſhment by ſuch a plea of mercy? Are not two thouſand Miniſters ſilenced, and more, that pleaded *Mercy* to themſelves and others, for the reaſon of their Non-conformity? Did your Learned, Pious, Moderate Biſhop, excuſe you for that plea? Doth not the expreſs words of the Law, and Canon, and Rubrick, and the ſentence and execution of all Judges to this day, confute your expoſition and exception?

You truly ſay [*It is a ſin to make a falſe conſtruction of the Law.*] But if againſt the expreſs words, and ſcope, and common judgment and execution, you will preſume to put your ſenſe, which is merciful, becauſe *Charity thinketh no evil.* Any thing, almoſt, may be ſo ſaid, conſented to, and ſworn.

I have ſpoken with a Papiſt that hath taken the Oath of Supremacy, and wrote for it; becauſe it is to be ſuppoſed that it is only the ſpiritual power called Paſtoral, which the Pope claimeth over *England*, or ſuch give him; and only the Power of the Sword which the King claimeth, and denyeth to him and Foreigners. And he citeth a fairer pretence for his expoſition than you do here for yours: And thus all may take up the Oath of Supremacy that hold but the Popes Spiritual Supre-

macy over us and all the world. What words can be so bad, that a man may not feign in Charity a good sense of?

§ 9. You say the Liturgy alloweth *private Baptism without the Cross, and God-fathers.* *Ans.* 1. Thence I must gather, that it doth not so allow publick Baptism; no not on pretence of necessity and mercy; else why had they not expresst their allowance of one as well as of the other? 2. And even there, it must be repeated after in the Congregation with God-fathers that believe, and promise in the *Name* of the Child; (And in the house there is nothing named, or required of the Parent, but *some one* (whoever) is only to *name* the Child.)

§ 10. In the Margin you say [*There is no ex-* "*press prohibition in all the Liturgy, tying Ministers* "*in no case, to baptize without the Cross, and to* "*give the Sacrament to kneelers only; and to bap-* "*tize none without Sureties.*]

Ans. I am glad that your whole writing savoureth of that spirit of Love and Christian Peace and Forbearance, as your dislike of these things signifieth. And while we agree about the sense of God's Law, we shall not break Charity for our differing of the sense of the Laws of man: But seeing you put these great points (of my Non-conformity) here together, I shall briefly repeat the reasons of my exposition against yours.

Words are to signifie the mind and the matter. If the Book speak intelligibly, so as to oblige us to one sense, it's nothing to our case whether the *prohibition be express.*

1. The Liturgy-Rubrick saith ["*There shall be* "*so*

"*for every male-child to be baptized, two God-*
"*fathers, and one God-mother; and for every fe-*
"*male, one God-father, and two God-mothers.*]

II. The whole tranſaction, beſide prayer to God, and the act of Baptizing, is mainly ſpeech to the God-fathers, and demands of them, and their anſwer, by profeſſing Abrenunciation, Faith, deſire to be Baptized, reſolved Obedience: They muſt name the Child. They are exhorted to ſee that the Child be taught what a ſolemn Vow, Promiſe and Profeſſion he made by them, *&c.* and to be brought up to the Biſhop to be confirmed.

III. In the Baptiſm of the Adult, the God-fathers are called but [*Witneſſes*] as not giving the perſon *Title* to Baptiſm. But in the Baptiſm of Infants, they do *profeſs* and *covenant* in the Child's name, and he doth it by them, as his very *Title.*

IV. The Catechiſm ſaith, That *Repentance* and *Faith* are required of perſons to be Baptized; and, as the old Book ſaid, *They perform them by their Sureties*; ſo the new one ſaith, *They promiſe them by their Sureties*, and therefore are Baptized.

V. For the Croſs, the Liturgy ſaith ["*Here the Prieſt ſhall make a Croſs on the Child's fore-head.*] And it referreth us to the Canon for the ſenſe and reaſons.

VI. The Communion-Rubrick ſaith, [*He ſhall deliver it into their hands, All meekly kneeling.*].

VII. The laſt Rubrick ſaith, [*It is ordained in this Office, that the Communicants ſhall receive the ſame kneeling.*]

VIII. The ſame Church by Can. 36. requi-
" reth every Miniſter to ſubſcribe that he *will uſe*
" *the Form in that Book preſcribed in Publick Prayer,*
" *and Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, and no*
" *other.*]

IX. And the Can. 27. ſaith, [" *No Miniſter when* " *he celebrates the Communion, ſhall wittingly ad-* " *miniſter the ſame to any, but to ſuch as kneel,* " *under pain of ſuſpenſion.*] Can the Church more plainly ſpeak the ſenſe of her Liturgy? You ſay *It is againſt Schiſmaticks.* Yes, 1. That is the end; and the words expreſs the means. 2. And it is expoſitory, calling thoſe Schiſmaticks that ſcruple and refuſe to kneel.

X. Thoſe that ſay the Liturgy hath any thing contrary to the Scripture, or that the Ceremonies are ſuch as he may not uſe, approve, *&c.* are excommunicate *ipſo facto*: And therefore as Schiſmaticks not to be admitted to the Sacrament till they repent of that their wicked Errour, Can. 4, 5, 6, 7.

XI. Can. 14. " *All Miniſters ſhall obſerve the* " *Orders, Rites and Ceremonies preſcribed in the* " *Book of Common-Prayer, as well in reading the* " *holy Scriptures, and ſaying of Prayers, as in ad-* " *miniſtration of the Sacraments, without either dimi-* " *niſhing, in regard of Preaching,* or in any other " reſpect (*note that*) or adding any thing in the " matter or form thereof.

XII. Can. 29. [" *No Parent ſhall be urged to* " *be preſent, nor be admitted to anſwer as God-* " *father for his own Child; nor any God-father or* " *God-mother ſhall be ſuffered to make any other an-* " *ſwer or ſpeech than by the Book of Common-Prayer* " *is preſcribed in that behalf.*]

If yet the Church have not declared her ſenſe of the Liturgy, but that I may Baptize without Croſs or God-fathers, and give the Sacrament to them that ſit, rather than refuſe them, I can underſtand

derſtand no mans words. And what can conſtrain an unwilling perſon to underſtand?

XIII. Yet I ſay again, If I practice on any pretence of mercy, according to your Rule, the Judges will condemn me; the Juſtices will ſend me to the common Gaol, among Rogues, to lie ſix months, and will fine me twenty pound, and forty pound a Sermon, as I have tryed; and the Biſhops or their Courts will excommunicate me, and proſecute me to lay me in Gaol; as you have tryed who fly to eſcape it. And are not theſe made Judges of the ſenſe of the Law? and will not all this convince us what it meaneth?

Becauſe you have put three of the chief matters of my Non-conformity here together, I have anſwered all together. If you will prefer the judgment of the Biſhops before all this, I pray you do not pretend that ſome honeſt Biſhop (that had no hand in our Changes and Silencing) ſaith to you in private; but get it us under the hands of many of them, if you can [that becauſe mercy is to be preferred before ſacrifice, we may Baptize without the Croſs, and God-fathers, and may give the Sacrament to them that kneel not, if they diſſent through conſciencious fear of living.]

CHAP. XVII.

§ 1. IN your ſixteenth Section you profeſs your liking of ſitting at the Lord's Supper rather than kneeling: How then can you declare [Aſſent, Conſent and Approbation] to the Liturgy

(expounded by the Canons) which in plain words, and by ſharp penalties on Diſſenters, ſo much preferreth kneeling before ſitting.

§ 2. Your preferring the *preaching and hearing of the Word, and Prayer, and Praiſe, as more excellent than the carnal* (you mean the *outward*) *part in the Lord's Supper*, is very far from Conformity to the common ſenſe of the Biſhops, who ordered the Altaring of the Communion Tables, and commended bowing towards them, and ſuſpended ſo many Miniſters on ſuch accounts; even far from the ſenſe of Arch-Biſhop *Laud*, expreſſed in his life by Dr. *Heylin*, and of the whole Church of *England* expreſſed in the Canons of 1640.

§ 3. I anſwered before your conceit that the Liturgy alloweth you to give the Sacrament to them that kneel not, and your diſtorting the Canon, becauſe the Title is againſt Schiſmaticks, when they mean that thoſe that kneel not, ſhall be taken and excluded as Schiſmaticks, and ſo excommunicated (as I have proved) and not that the word is diſtinguiſhing and limiting, allowing you to admit thoſe to ſit that are not Schiſmaticks. The Biſhops will deride that Expoſition. They that heard us at the *Savoy*, can tell you who that Dr. (now a Dean) was, who craved leave to have diſputed the Caſe againſt me, and to have proved [*That it is an Act of mercy to thoſe that ſcruple and refuſe to receive the Sacrament kneeling, to deny them the Communion of the Church therein.*]

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

§ 1. YOur ſeventeenth Section is for the Croſs in Baptiſm. I diſtinctly proved that the Church impoſeth it ["As a Symbol of our "Chriſtian Profeſſion, and as a conſecrating "dedicating ſign, by which 1. God's part of "the Covenant is ſignified, even the Grace by "him given, and the duty by him impoſed on us. "2. And the Receiver's part is ſignified, and by "ſolemn Engagement there profeſſed, even his "*Faith* in Chriſt crucified, and his reſolution and "ſelf-obliging Conſent or Covenant to be the "Lords as dedicated to him, and to perform all "the future duties of the Covenant, And that this is the true deſcription of a Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace. The word [Sacrament] largſier taken, may ſignifie no more than man may inſtitute: But a *Sacrament ſtrictly* taken as thus deſcribed, I ſuppoſe man may not inſtitute. 1. Becauſe Chriſt hath inſtituted two as an act of his Royal Prerogative. And if any Inſtitution be proper to his Kingly and Prieſtly Power, it muſt be ſuch: No other can be named excluding this. And if none be proper, what is it for him to be Great and One Law-giver to his Church? If *Legiſlation*, the chief part of Supreme Government, be common to him and Biſhops, why is not that Royally Common?

2. And if Chriſt would have had any more Sacraments of the Covenant of Grace, he would have ſomewhere expreſſed his Commands and Directions to his Miniſters to make them: But he that hath given them full Commands and Di-

rections for Preaching, Prayer, Baptizing, and his Supper; and for their other duties for the Flocks, hath not said a word to them of this; either biding them make new Sacraments, or telling them how many, or directing them what, or how to do it; nor how to use them when made; nor promising to bless them.

3. To make more, seemeth to accuse Christ's Law or Institution of Imperfection: Subordinate actions do not so: But to make Ordinances *ejusdem generis*, with those which he made, not as a meer man, nor as a meer Minister, but as Mediator, or King of the Church, doth seem to say, That Christ left half his work undone. Did he institute Baptism and his Supper, as a meer Man, or a meer Minister? then *à quatenus ad omne* any *Man*, or any *Minister* may do the like, and make more Sacraments: But if as King of the Church, and as Saviour, then none but our King of the Chuch and Saviour may do the like.

Christ hath instituted one day of each week to commemorate his Resurrection, as God the Creator instituted a weekly Sabbath (as I have proved in a peculiar Treatise.) Men may set apart one day in a year for special Thanksgivings, or Commemorations, and one day in a week, *e. g.* in a time of Plague and danger, to fast and pray, *&c.* But if any should make another weekly day of holy observance, to commemorate the same work of Christ's Resurrection, or our Redemption, which Christ did separate that day to commemorate, I think he would be both an unjust accuser of Christ's Law, as insufficient, and an unjust usurper of his Prerogative.

4. And

4. And it is conſiderable to me, that though Chriſt ſo extraordinarily Commiſſioned and Qualified his Apoſtles to record his Words and Acts in Scripture, and ſettle Church-Orders and Inferiour Offices, and teach the Nations to obſerve all that he had Commanded them; yet even them did did he never Commiſſion to make a new Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace; nor did they ever make one; but contrarily rebuked thoſe that would but have kept up ſome of the old Ceremonies, Divine or Humane: And was not the Croſs a ſtumbling and fooliſhneſs to the World in the Apoſtles Days? and yet they never made ſuch a Sacrament. And who hath equal Power with them?

§ 2. If any ſay the Church doth not make it a Sacrament, I anſwer: 1. It is not the *Name* that we contend about, but the thing. 2. I have before proved it by the Conſtitutive parts which you anſwer not. 3. If Chriſt had Inſtituted the Croſs as the Church doth, [*as a Badg of our Chriſtianity, dedicating the Child to God as a ſolemn Covenanting Figure, by which the Miniſter in God's Name, and in the Perſons, pronounceth him Conſecrated and engaged, as ſignifying both God's part or Grace of the Covenant, and Mans part or Duty.*] I ask, Whether you would not have called this a Sacrament? And if it want but *Divine Inſtitution* and *Benediction*, it wanteth indeed a due Efficient, but it is ſtill a Humane Sacrament, though not a Divine; and therefore an unlawful Sacrament. I would but know whether Men may make New Sacraments of the Covenant of Grace, or not? If yea, how many? and *Quo jure?*

§ 3. And

§ 3. And God's Prohibition, *Deut.* 12. of adding or diminiſhing, is not waſht away ſo eaſily as your words would make Men believe. You ſay, *It reacheth to the whole Duty of Man, and Government of the Church*, &c. *Anſ.* There be ſome things in the Duty of Man and Church-Matters, that God hath left to Man: To do thoſe is no addition to God's Laws: But to do the like work that God by his Law hath done, which he never left to Man, ſeemeth to me the Addition there forbidden: *e. g.* If Men had made another Tabernacle, another Ark of the Covenant, another holy Veſtment for *Aaron*, another Sacrament like Circumciſion, or the Paſſeover; he that ſo reproved their worſhiping in the High Places, would have reproved theſe.

§ 4. But the ſum of your defence is *ad Hominem* to my ſelf, for granting the lawfulneſs of humane private profeſſing Signs, and of the Croſs as ſuch: It's ſtrange to me, that you that are ſo judicious, can diſcern no more difference between, 1. Private and publick Church-actions. And, 2. Between a bare profeſſing Sign *in genere*, and a *Sacramental Covenanting-dedicating Symbolical Sign* in ſpecie.

1. Every Sacramental Symbol is a profeſſing Sign: But every profeſſing Sign is not a Sacramental Symbol (a ſolemn Sacramental Celebration of a Mutual Covenant, by an inveſting ſignification of the parts of both the Covenants.) Doth it follow then, that becauſe Men (yea, any Man) may make a profeſſing Sign of his Mind, that Man (yea, every Man) may make a new Sacrament? An *Iſraelite* might have lift up his Hand

Hand to ſignifie conſent to a Duty, or to anſwer a Queſtion: But might he therefore have imitated Circumciſion, or the Paſſeover? When a Man is Baptized, if you ask him whether he conſent, he may ſignifie it by *Bowing, lifting up his Hand, by Writing*, which are all but to the ſame uſe as Speech: But he muſt Sacramentally ſignifie it by the reception of Baptiſm, as the inſtituted ſolemn Covenanting Symbol of his Religion. But for any to make to the Church of Chriſt, a new Sacramental Symbol for ſuch a Covenanting uſe, is another Matter.

A Man that at the Lord's Supper, is asked whether he conſent to Chriſt's Covenant, may ſignifie it as aforeſaid: But he may not therefore joyn to the Sacrament ſuch another Covenanting Symbol of Chriſtianity, *e. g.* To make (or conſent to, and approve and uſe) a Law that all Chriſtians ſhall, ſolemnly after the Euchariſt, have their Heads anointed with Oyl, to ſignifie that they are Members of Chriſt, and hereby Covenant with him and the Holy Ghoſt, as ſignifying his Grace received, and their Duty performed and promiſed; and this applied by a Miniſter Officiating, as by his Commiſſion.

§ 4. I perceive by your miſtaking Inferences, that you underſtood not my diſtinction of *Private* and *Publick*, and thought I had meant *Secret*, or *Open*, or before *Few* or *Many*: Whereas I ſpeak in the ſenſe that theſe words are commonly uſed in Politicks, *e. g.* When they diſtinguiſh *Index publicus & privatus, Res publicæ & privatæ, Actiones publicæ & privatæ*, &c. Publick is that which either belongeth to the *Society*, or a *Publick Officer*

Officer as such: As a meer Subject is *Homo privatus*, so his Actions and Affairs, meerly as his, are *private*: The *Ærarium* of the Commonwealth though kept secretly is the *publick Treasure*. The judgment of a publick Judge, when few are present in his Chamber, is *Judicium publicum*; and the judgment of a meer Arbitrator before thousands, is *Judicium privatum*: A private Man's arbitrary Words or Actions in *Westminster-Hall* at the Bar, are *Actiones privatæ*.

§ 5. I have more reverence for the Ancient Christians, than to be a bold condemner of all their Actions, which I wish they had not done (and had they foreseen the Consequents, they would not have done). And I must, *Fide humanâ*, give some credit to those ancient Writers, specially such as *Augustine*, who tells us of Miracles adjoyned to some use of the Cross: And considering how they used it, I find it was (when those things were done) as a private arbitrary professing Sign, such as it would have been to say by words [*I am a Christian,*] or [*I trust in Christ,*] or [*I am not ashamed of a Crucified Saviour.*] And if when one asked them of their Faith, or derided them for trusting in a Crucified Man, they answered by crossing, I judge them not for so doing: The occasions and Persons might excuse such a private professing Action. But if they would turn this into a *publick Church-Ordinance by a Law, and into a Humane Sacrament* of the *Covenant of Grace*, requiring all to receive it as the common Badge of Christianity; I reproach not the approvers, but I dare not approve it, or so use it.

§. 6. You

§ 6. You ſay, [*We muſt reduce what is ſaid in the Canon to the words in the* 39 *Articles, and the Liturgy, for they contradict not themſelves.*]

Anſ. There is no ſhew of contradiction. If the Church in three Books expreſs her ſenſe, muſt I not ſet all together, and take them in all? And when the Liturgy purpoſely referreth the unſatisfied to the Canon for her ſenſe and reaſon, it's an odd way of expounding it, to forſake the Canons Expoſition, and ſay, I reduce it to the Liturgy. Doubtleſs all three together expreſs their ſenſe.

§ 7. The ſecond Commandment forbad not all private uſe of Images, either a Civil, or meer Memorative or Monitory private (yea, or publick) uſe. As it forbad not *Jacob* to pitch a ſtone of remembrance, or the *Iſraelites* to make a Memorative and Monitory Altar, and yet forbad ſuch an Altar for Worſhip to be erected without God's Order. But it was *external ſymbolizing with Idolaters by Images*, which the ſecond Commandment forbad; that is, either worſhiping them, or God by them; or by ſetting them up in the place of Worſhip, ſeeming ſo to do. So it is not all uſe of a Croſs that breaketh the ſecond Commandment. When you have proved lifting up the hand, or laying it on the Book, *&c.* to be Sacraments, I ſhall further anſwer you: Or if the ſecond Commandment oblige us not to uſe *Chriſt's Sacraments* (as it is now one of Chriſt's Commandments) then I ſhall confeſs that it forbiddeth not us to deviſe the like.

§ 8. You ſay, [*If it be a Sacrament, it would be univerſally unlawful. If Baptiſm had not been ordained*

ordained by Christ, it would have been traiterous and sinful to use it as a Sacrament.] *Ans.* You grant us enough; I durst not have used the word *traiterous* so boldly, lest I should anger the Conformists. But when did you prove that every *professing sign* is used to the same use *in specie*, as the covenanting dedicating Symbol of the Cross is? This was a supposition not so easily to have been begged.

§ 9. As to my Simile, *That Baptism is Christ's Badge or Colours*; it illustrates in the point of similitude: And so it doth, that the King would take it ill to have a publick badge of the Order of the Garter to be added to his Star by a private Subject, much more for any to make a Law for all his Subjects, to be known by a badge of private invention.

You say, *That it's lawful to wear those Colours in the Troop, which he may wear out. Ans.* Yes, if he may wear them out *in specie* to the same use and ends. But if you at a Funeral wear a black *Ribbon*, and your General's Colours be white; and some Souldiers will make a Law, That the badge of all the Souldiers shall be *black Ribbons*, joyned to the white, it would not then be lawful for you in or out of the Troop to wear that black as the badge of a Souldier, much less to declare that you approved of, and consented to the imposition. And when you tell me, *I allow the use of it*, I tell you, *I allow not your use prescribed by the Church.*

You say, *I can never prove that Christ forbad it*: And yet you say before that, *It's traiterous to have made a Sacrament (without Christ.)*

But

But you affirm, That it's made but for the ſame uſe in Baptiſm, which I allow out. But why did you not give ſome anſwer to my expreſs proof of the contrary? Or why put you me ſo oft to repeat it? It is an outward viſible ſign, by which in the ſolemnizing of the Covenant between Chriſt and us, the perſon is dedicated to God, by receiving the ſaid ſign of the Grace of the Covenant, and the obligation of the Covenant, and of the perſons profeſſed conſent and engagement to the duties of it.

1. That it is a *Badge* of Chriſtianity, the thirtieth Canon ſaith twice.

2. That it is an *honourable Badge by which the Infant is dedicated to the ſervice of God*; the ſame Canon ſaith.

3. That it is a *Covenanting ſign*, both the celebrating words, and theſe of the Canon ſhew.

4. That it is a ſign of profeſſed *Conſent* to the *Covenant-duties* there named [*Not to be aſhamed to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner againſt the World, Fleſh and Devil, and to continue Chriſt's faithful Servant and Souldier to his lives end.*] The words ſhew, and none denyeth.

5. That it is an *Obliging ſign*, both as impoſed by God's Miniſter, and as ſelf-obliging by the ſaid profeſſed Conſent, is alſo expreſt in the ſame words. And this is it which is called The *Covenant-Vow*. The perſon is Vowed or Devoted to God by two Sacramental ſigns, Baptiſm and the Croſs.

6. That it ſignifieth alſo God's Grace given by that Covenant, the words of the expoſitory Canon 30 ſhew: [*To dedicate them by that badge to his*

his ſervice, whoſe benefits beſtowed on them in Baptiſm, the name of the Croſs did repreſent [*To the ſervice of him that dyed on the Croſs.*]

7. Yea, that it is an *Inveſting ſign*, delivering the Church-priviledges, appeareth in the words: [*We receive this Child into the Congregation of Chriſt's Flock, and do ſign him with the ſign of the Croſs.*]

8. And that it is to operate Grace morally on the *Intelligent*, is expreſt in the foreſaid words of inſtructing and obliging ſignification, with the preface of the Liturgy [*To ſtir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God by a notable and ſpecial ſignification whereby he might be edified.*]

§ 10. *Anno* 1660. endeavouring to prevent what followed, I uſed theſe ſame reaſons with the great Biſhop, who, I think, hath had the firſt and and chief hand in the matter as it ſtandeth, and he denyed but two things of the Sacramental Croſs; 1. That it is of God's inſtitution, which he thought eſſential to a Church-Sacrament: To which I ſay, It is a humane unlawful Sacrament; but that it is not Divine we eaſily grant.

2. *That the Croſs giveth Grace.* I anſwered, that *effectually it doth not*, becauſe God will not bleſs unlawful means: But it is appointed by man to give or work Grace. This I proved, 1. Becauſe as it is a Receiving ſign into the Church, it delivereth by Inveſtiture the Relative Grace of Church-priviledges. 2. As the Water of Baptiſm worketh morally, by ſignifying the waſhing of Chriſt's Blood; ſo the Croſs is to operate morally, by ſignifying Chriſt's Crucifixion, the benefits of the Croſs, and

and our duty. But he laid the ſtreſs of his Cauſe on this aſſertion, That Sacraments, as ſuch, are to give grace otherwiſe than by ſuch moral operation; and it is no Sacrament that is not inſtituted to give God's grace otherwiſe than morally.] I told him how commonly Proteſtants maintain that they are not inſtituted to give grace phyſically; but only *morally*, and by inveſtiture in relations. And here we broke.

And becauſe I muſt expect that from others that are driven to it, this will be the laſt refuge; I will add, that even the wiſeſt Papiſts themſelves do maintain only ſuch moral Cauſality in Sacraments.

§ 11. And here, with reſpect to the forementioned Article of the certainty of Baptized Infants Salvation; and alſo the anſwering of this Objection, I ſhall cite ſome of their words, to ſhew you at how great a loſs the moſt Learned Papiſts are about things that every poor Engliſh Miniſter may *be certain* of, or profeſs to hold, or elſe be ſilenced or ruined: Though it be aſcribing too much to the *opus operatum* in Sacraments that we grievouſly accuſe the Papiſts of.

1. *Aquinas* of the Efficacy of Sacraments, ſaith, 1. That they are *aliquo modo Cauſæ gratiæ*. 2. Not meerly *Cauſa ſine qua non*. 3. *Aqua baptiſmatis habet operationem propriam in Corpus, & ut inſtrumentum Divinæ miſericordiæ, habet effectum ulteriorem; non ad gratiam quaſi eam attingens in virtute principalis agentis, ſed ad diſpoſitionem præviam; quæ in quibuſdam ſacramentis eſt Character, in aliis aliquis ornatus animæ proportionatus Characteri.* 4. *In ſacramentis eſt aliqua virtus ſupernaturalis quæ eſt ipſis principium agendi in*

quantum ſunt inſtrumenta Divinæ miſericordiæ. Et hæc virtus eſt Ens ſpirituale, incompletum ſive intentionale.

Scotus and *Ockam* confute this at large; and *Pet. de Aliaco Card. Cameracenſis* (a moſt judicious School-man) briefly after them in 4. *q.* 1. *B.* C contending that Sacraments are properly *no Cauſes* of grace, but improperly; becauſe *Deus in ſacramentis ordinavit ſic agere, non quod ipſa ſacramenta agant: Et de tali ordinatione & libera promiſſione ipſe certificavit Eccleſiam: Vel ex ſola voluntate alterius ut Cauſa ſine qua non, quæ non invenitur in naturalibus; ſed (ſicut meritum) in Moralibus; & proprie non eſt cauſa: Et quod ſacramentum ſive per virtutem propriam, ſive per virtutem ei collatam, non eſt proprie Cauſa Efficiens alicujus diſpoſitionis in anima ad gratiam præviæ (aut ipſius gratiæ.)*

So that their judgment is, that it is only *Conditio ſine qua non, diſpoſitiva, moralis* (improperly called *diſpoſitiva,*) and not of the *effecting*, but the *reception* of grace. A man that doth uſe God's Ordinance, being in the way where God doth give his grace, and performeth the receptive Condition: Yet none of them deny a *Moral Objective Cauſality* on the Conſidering Adult.

And *Brianſon* in 4. *q.* 1. *fol.* 6. 1. *doc.* concludeth *Sacramenta non ſunt Cauſa effectiva gratiæ, ſed ſolum per modum meriti; per ea datur gratia*] citing *Ricardus, Scotus, Aureolus, Fr. Peruſius*, &c. againſt *Thomas* and *Alexand.* herein.

And 4. *q.* 9. *Concl.* 1. *fol.* 152. he ſaith [*Baptiſmus indiget* fide, (*quæ eſt diſpoſitio & fundamentum omnium ſacramentorum*) *vel in ſe, ut in adultis*; vel in alio, *ut in parvulis, pro quibus ſunt*

Fide-

Fide-juſſores Paternus & Materna.] And if ſo, what undoubted certainty is there of thouſands whoſe God-Fathers themſelves have no true Faith.

And, *Quod ficte recipientes Baptiſmum non habent gratiam Baptiſmi, dicunt Scholaſtici. vide* Brianſon, in 4 q. 4. Doct. 1. Fol. 34.

And even Pope *Gregory* 7. (*Hildebrand*) in Roman Council ſaith, [*That neither feigned Faith in Baptiſm, nor feigned Repentance in Penance, do ſave any.*] I know what ſome ſay for the ſaving of all Heathens, Infidels, or Atheiſts Infants, ſnatcht perhaps by military force to Baptiſm, *viz. Ex fide Eccleſiæ*, of which I have ſpoken elſewhere (in *Chriſt. Directory.*) But their proofs I take for Error and worſe.

And as to this and their Cauſality *Ex opere operato*, Suarez ſaith, (*de Legib. li.* 9. *c.* 6. *pag.* 748. *Col.* 2. *de Circumciſ.*) *Nam etiam ipſa fides parentum erat conditio neceſſaria, & ſine qua non; & tamen de illa non dici poteſt quod gratiam daret Infanti ex opere operato, nec quod gratiam contineret; imò nec cauſa juſtificans parvulos dici poteſt, niſi latè aut improprio modo, ſicut dicitur de quolibet remedio ſeu conditione ſine qua non.*] Whence he inferreth, that Circumciſion did not juſtifie Infants.

And even *Petr. à Sancto Joſeph.* ſaith (*Theſ. Univerſ. de Sacrament.* pag. 93.) *Sacramentum eſt ſignum ſenſibile Divinitùs inſtitutum longo tempore durans, Sanctitatem aliquam, ſaltem E X T E R N A M, conferens, & veram ſignificans: Et* pag. 101. Though with the higheſt he hold, that [*Sacramenta novæ legis conferunt gratiam, idq; ex opere operato & immediate; duplicem ſcilicet; aliam reſpondentem diſpoſitioni, aliam ipſi Sa-*

cramento, tum antiqua adultis nullam conferrent niſi ratione diſpoſitionis: Yet he ſaith, [*Sacramenta novæ Legis non producunt gratiam* Phyſice *ſed Moraliter.*]

And when the *Papiſts* that muſt exceed in aſcribing to Sacraments, have no more to ſay, and are at ſuch a loſs, we leave it to the judgment of the Impartial, whether no *Proteſtant* ſhould be ſuffered to Preach the Goſpel without Ruine, who cannot declare that [*It is certain by the Word of God, that Infants Baptized and dying before actual Sin, are undoubtedly ſaved,*] none excepted: And whether Phyſical, or any but Relative and Moral Efficacy be eſſential to a Sacrament; or any ſave Aptitudinal, or fitneſs, to convey to fit Receivers.

And whether as to the new Article of Faith, it had not been enough for us to have ſaid as the Synod of *Dort. Art.* 1. *c.* 17. [*Quandoquidem de voluntate Dei ex verbis ipſius nobis eſt judicandum, quod teſtatur liberos fidelium eſſe Sanctos, non quidem Natura ſed beneficio fœderis gratuiti, in quo illi cum Parentibus comprehenduntur; pii Parentes de electione & ſalute ſuorum, quos Deus in Infantia ex hâc Vita evocat, dubitare non debent.*]

And I *diſſent* not from the old Rubrick, [*That no Man ſhall think if any Detriment ſhall come to Children by deferring of their Confirmation, he ſhall know for truth, that it is certain by God's Word, that Children being Baptized, have all things neceſſary for their Salvation, and be undoubtedly ſaved.*] That is, without any other Sacrament, ſuppoſing them to be the Children of the Faithful: And I am ſorry any Diſpute of mine occaſioned

ſtained any one to endeavour the altering of theſe words ſo much for the worſe. But I have long digreſſed.

§ 12. If God's Word were not the ſufficient Law by which your Cauſe and ours are to be tryed, I would vie with you againſt your Plea from Humane Opinion, or Authority: And ſhew you, 1. That the Apoſtles not uſing it, will weigh down the Ancients and others uſing it. 2. That the Ancients uſed it not ſo ill as we muſt do, as a Sacrament of the Covenant; but as a meer profeſſing Sign of their not being aſhamed of Chriſt; till it did degenerate by degrees. 3. That the Learning and Piety of them that have refuſed it, hath been equal to theirs that ſo uſed it. 4. That he that readeth *Bernard*, *Gerſon*, *Kempis*, *Thauluus*, *Gerhardus*, *Zutphanienſis*, *Sales*, and abundance ſuch (yea, Perſons of Reſolution) will think there have been very holy *Papiſts*; and for number they exceed the *Proteſtants*: And yet that proveth not *Popery* to be lawful. 5. That the Baptized's White Garment, Milk and Hony, not kneeling on Lord's Days, *&c.* were more generally uſed of old, and yet are not now ſo well thought of: Nor the giving the Euchariſt to Infants, nor the Millenary Doctrine, much the Ancients Language, like the *Arrians*, which *Petavius* citeth.

§ 13. Your main Argument you ſay, is, that [*Ye obey that Command*, Mat. 28. 19. And Chriſt doth not forbid you to uſe the Croſs.] *Anſ.* As if you ſhould ſay, When I Celebrate Chriſt's two Sacraments, I obey his Commands; and he hath not forbidden me to uſe two (or ten) more. As when you are commanded to believe in Chriſt as

your Saviour, it is implied that you muſt take no other for your Saviour; ſo when you are commanded to Hear and Obey him as the great Prophet and King of the Church, it is implied that you Hear and Obey no other as ſuch: And therefore give to no other any of the Prerogatives of Chriſt, and aſcribe nothing to Man's Law which is proper to his, which you confeſs to make a Sacrament is: Leſt your hear, *In vain do they Worſhip me, teaching for Doctrine the Traditions of Men:* If it be Sin, it is worſe than Suffering. Do you think Worſhiping in the high Places, was worſe than this?

§ 14. You plead the Law of Nature, even Mercy to the Magiſtrate's Soul, to keep him from Silencing and Perſecuting; and to the Peoples Souls, that they may have good Miniſters.] *Anſ.* What then? If the Croſs be lawful to be uſed as preſcribed, then no doubt I ſhould uſe it. If it be not, muſt I ſin when the Magiſtrate bids me to ſave him from Perſecuting me? The Martyrs might ſo have ſaved *Bonner* and *Gardiner*, by a Lye: But this is no ſaving them: For if they Firſt draw me to Sin, endanger my Soul, and would Silence me, or deſtroy my Body if I did not; this doth increaſe their Guilt, and not diminiſh it. 2. And you may exerciſe Mercy to the People, as Miniſters did the firſt 300 Years, in a Suffering way, and by good Example, better than by Sin, and conſent to corrupt the Miniſtry and Church.

§ 15. You call the Croſſing, and ſuch things [" *Trifles and Bawbles, on which weak and child-*
" *iſh Minds dote, yet wiſe Parents may pleaſe their*
" *Chil-*

"*Children with Bawbles.*] *Anſ.* The Biſhops will be more offended at this, than the Non-conformiſts: They that cannot allow us the pity due to weak Children, will not take it well to be told that we are Fathers, and they the Children whom we muſt pleaſe with Bawbles.

And you ſay, ["*The external part of Baptiſm,* "*is not ſo excellent as Prayer or Preaching.*] *Water* and *Words*, be not matters worth our comparing; but remember, *Words* are part of Baptiſm too; and the Solemnizing the great Vow and Covenant between God and believing Sinners, on the terms and to the great ends of Baptiſm, is a high tranſaction of unſpeakable Concern: And it's ſhame to many that cry out againſt *Anabaptiſts*, that they reverence it far leſs than they.

§ 16. But you ſay, ["*We aſſent not, and con-*"*ſent not to the Impoſing of it.*] *Anſ.* Nor I, and therefore I will not ſay that I do. Is not the *Impoſing of the Croſs expreſly in the Book?* And do you not plead for it openly, declaring that you *Aſſent* and *Conſent to all things contained in it, and preſcribed by it?* What can be plainer?

§ 17. You ſay, ["*It's better to do a doubtful* "*ſmall Evil, than forbear a certain and great* "*Good.*] *Anſ.* Negatives bind *ad ſemper*, but Affirmatives do not. And that which is *Evil* and *not Good*, is ill called *Better*: No evil muſt be done that can be avoided: None that good may come of it. The Apoſtles and Paſtors of the three firſt Ages did good againſt the will of Governors. What if a Man doubt whether a Lye or Perjury be Sin in ſuch a caſe? muſt he therefore do it that he may Preach without Perſecution?

It is no Duty to you, much less a greater which you cannot do, but on condition you will Sin.

§ 18. You say that ["*Though he that doubteth is damned if he eat, the case is not like the using of the Cross, because there is liberty.*]

Ans. I have said so much of *Rom.* 14. in my Treatise of the *Church Called*, that I need not add much more. The advantage seemeth to me more on the other side: They that did eat, or forbear, did it in Conscience to the Will of God, as they that kept a Day or not. But that Text expresly commanding even Church-Governors, to do nothing contrary to mutual forbearance in such things; here Conscience towards God is set against our obeying the supposed unlawful command of Man, and our escaping Persecution. The *Jews* then Persecuted those Christians that would not conform to their Law in Meats and Days, even to the Death, and more sharply than the *Romans* did: And they seemed to be Scandalized by them, to the hindrance of their Conversion. Why then, was that Case free, and ours of the Cross not free?

CHAP. XIX.

§ 1. YOur 18th Section is about giving the Sacrament to all the Parishioners, thrice a Year. You say, *It could not be the Churches meaning to give it to all.*

Ans. Darkness is a great advantage to one that must be hid, or run away; and confusion to one that must defend an Error. They are two distinct

ſtinct parts of our Diſſent, 1. That all the Pariſhioners are enjoined to Communicate thrice a Year. 2. That we are enjoined to give it (not to all, but) to more than we can with a ſafe Conſcience. You prove that there are Limitations to the laſt; but that proveth not that they are ſo to the firſt.

Do you think that it will excuſe a Man that Communicates not, to ſay, [I am not willing to be Confined,] or [I am out of Charity,] or (I am a ſcandalous Sinner,) or (the Church did ſuſpend me for Scandal, or Contumacy:) If it will, the *Papiſts* may ſave their Eſtates, or others called New Recuſants at leaſt: But the Law and Liturgy, and Canon, all ſhew the contrary: If they are unfit, it's long of themſelves, ſay they: And that ſhall not excuſe them from a Gaol.

You will ſay, It commandeth them not to receive unfit, but to be fit and then receive. *Anſ.* True: But, 1. All the Pariſh of natural Capacity are commanded to be fit and then receive, and puniſhed if they do not, though morally never ſo unfit. 2. Fitneſs is not gotten by bare Commands. 3. There are multitudes unfit, and ought not in that unfitneſs to receive, that *the Law* layeth no hold on for any other Fault; and many that cannot receive it; much leſs can the Miniſter by the Law keep away. Too many know themſelves to be ſecret Atheiſts, and more to be Infidels, or Sadduces, that believe no Life to come: Many are conſcious of ſecret Fornication, Drunkenneſs, Stealing, Deceiving, &c. The Miniſter or Magiſtrate is no judge of theſe: Yet if they Communicate not, they break the Rubrick and Law, and are to be puniſhed. Many hundreds are conſcious

of

of ſecret unpreparedneſs, and many timorous honeſt People ſo afraid of eating and drinking Judgment, &c. that they dare not come: And many on many accounts are unwilling; and yet all theſe are commanded to come. In a word, No *unwilling Perſon* hath right to the Sacramental Benefits: and yet all ſuch are commanded on great Penalties to Communicate thrice a Year.

2. And I hinted how many were forced to admit to our wrong and theirs; which you anſwer not.

CHAP. XX.

§ 1. YOur 19th Section is for our accuſing thoſe that we refuſe to the *Ordinance*, within fourteen days, that he may proceed againſt them according to the Canon. And firſt you tell us a ſtrange thing, which were it true, would half reconcile me to the *Engliſh* ſort of Prelacy, *viz.* ["*That the leſſer Excommunication out of a par-*"*ticular Congregation, ſeems to be allowed to all* "*the Pariſh Miniſters.*] Say you ſo! What a ſleep have I been in theſe 50 Years, (ſince I have been Ordained it's 41 Years) that never could hear or read of any ſuch thing? I have indeed read ſome honeſt Paſſages like it, in the *Reformatio Legum Eccleſiaſt.* publiſhed by *John Fox*, which died before it was born, and only ſhewed the good purpoſes of King *Edward*, and his Divines. But in our Articles, Canons, Liturgies, or Book of Ordination, I can find no ſuch thing, nor imagine what could thus deceive you. Nor can I ſee any ſuch

ſuch thing in *Coſins*'s Tables, nor in any Conformiſt's Writings, which deſcribe our Church Government. What was in Doctor *Mocket's* Book that was burnt, I know not; By the Execution done on it, and their hatred of Arch-Biſhop *Abbot*, I ſhould think it was as likely to be there as any where: But if it were, it is no proof. The Laws and Authorized Church-Canons and Forms, muſt decide the Caſe. Were there but any tolerable Pariſh Diſcipline, I would never quarrel againſt Dioceſans; Nay, could I but have been a Paſtor, and not a meer Slave, or Executioner of the will of others, againſt my Conſcience.

§ 2. I cannot imagine what you mean, unleſs it be that the Canon and Rubrick ſay, That we ſhall not *admit to the Communion*, ſuch [*As be openly known to live in Sin, notorious, without Repentance, nor any who have maliciouſly and openly contended with their Neighbours, till they be Reconciled; nor any that deſire not Confirmation.*]

But, 1. Do you take this temporary ſuſpenſion of my act of delivering this Man the Sacrament, to be the *Minor Excommunication*, viz. *out of that particular Congregation?* You are much miſtaken, as any Biſhop or Chancellor can tell you. He is Member of that Congregation ſtill: You only ſuſpend your own Act, and his Reception, till his Caſe be tried and judged by the Chancellor, or Dioceſan, whether he ſhall be caſt out, or not.

2. Nay, could all our importunity with the Biſhops, have prevailed but for a Power in the *Pariſh Miniſter*, (for Paſtor they would not have been called) to *ſuſpend his own Act, and not give, or deny the Sacrament againſt his knowledg and* Con-

Conſcience, I ſhould not have ſaid much againſt Dioceſans, nor any reaſonable Appeals to them. But I will tell you what I take our Caſe to be, after my long enquiry.

I. The great Pariſhes that have many ſcore thouſand Souls, are ſuch as the Prieſt (or Incumbent, I may call him) knoweth not one of a multitude of his Pariſhioners. (And Biſhop *Taylor* of *Repentance Pref.* ſaith, *A man cannot take charge of, or anſwer for the Souls that he knoweth not.*) And though fame ſay, That in ſuch a Pariſh there are multitudes of Atheiſts, Infidels, Hobbiſts, Brutiſts, Socinians, Drunkards, Whoremongers, Perjured, &c. while they are almoſt all ſtrangers to the Miniſter, he can deny the Sacrament to none of them *pro tempore*. And how can the Incumbent know in ſuch Pariſhes what they are?

II. If he know a man to be a Papiſt, if he be a Church-Papiſt, or have a diſpenſation, he cannot on that account deny him the Sacrament. Yea, Dr. *Heylin* in the Life of Arch-Biſhop *Laud*, maketh it his commendable deſign to have drawn the Papiſts into our Churches, (as they were, ſay ſome others, in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign; and this, ſay they, is to be a Queen *Elizabeth* Proteſtant, to be one that will communicate with the Papiſts in our Liturgy.) But many good Miniſters dare not give the Sacrament to a Papiſt, till he repent and renounce the Papal Univerſal Government, and their groſſeſt corruptions.

III. If the Miniſter know any man to be an Adulterer, Fornicator, Drunkard, or Heretick, or Infidel, by private conference, confeſſion, or other notice, and cannot prove it, he muſt give him the Sacrament.

IV. If

IV. If he (that converſeth not with one of an hundred himſelf, and can know them but by hear-ſay) ſhall hear a neighbour or two, or ten, report that ſuch a one is taken by thoſe that converſe with him to be an Heretick, Atheiſt, Infidel, Scorner at Chriſt and Scripture, a Fornicator, Drunkard, *&c.* he cannot deny him the Sacrament unleſs the reporters will ſtand to it as witneſſes. And it's known, 1. That few that can prove it will tell it the Miniſter. 2. Good people that hear it, cannot prove it. 3. Thoſe that can prove it, and privately tell it, will not trouble themſelves, and offend their neighbours, by witneſſing it openly. What need we more than experience? Do not your Books and Complaints tell us, that not only Coffee-houſes and Taverns, but other places are witneſſes of abounding Atheiſm, Infidelity, or Sadduceiſm; and that our Pariſhes have great numbers of them? And how many ſuch have you known in *London* excommunicated, or openly ſuſpended? And are not the *London* Miniſters able good men, that would do it if they could? Ask them why it's never done. If you ſay, that ſuch come not, but excommunicate themſelves: I anſwer, 1. Are they not ſtill members of the Pariſh-Church? 2. How doth the Miniſter know that they come not, who knoweth very few of his Pariſhoners? 3. It's known by their acquaintance, that ſuch ordinarily communicate ſo far as to ſatisfie the Law. For what ſhould hinder them when it is their intereſt?

V. If the Miniſter ſhould have private proof againſt one Atheiſt of forty; or one Drunkard or Fornicator of many, if he cannot get his witneſſes

to

to travel far, and for nothing become odious to the accuſed, to atteſt it before the Chancellor or Biſhop, the Miniſter muſt give him the Sacrament after he is acquit by the Court for want of proof.

VI. If proof be brought, and the Proctors fail managing it, or the Chancellor favour the accuſed, or the man reſolve before he goeth [I will ſay, I repent, and then deny me the Sacrament if you dare,] or if his ſaying he repenteth, ſatisfie the Judge that knoweth him not, while the Miniſter that is his neighbour heareth no ſign of it; but contrarily of his malice againſt him for accuſing him, he muſt ſtill give him the Sacrament, if the Chancellor acquits him.

VII. Nay, if he be excommunicated firſt, and by friends, fees, or ſaying I repent, get the Chancellor's Abſolution, he muſt be received to Communion, though the Miniſter ſee not the leaſt ſign of his repentance, but the contrary.

VIII. If Ignorance be ſo common in the Pariſh, that we have reaſon to judge that of twenty or thirty thouſand Pariſhioners (more or fewer) one half of them underſtand not the very Eſſentials of *Chriſtianity*, and of the Sacrament; yet the Miniſter muſt refuſe none. I that have but three ſervants, can ſeldom have all three ſuch as with my plain teaching will be brought while they are with me, to underſtand all the Eſſentials, and be capable of the Sacrament. And though in general experience telleth us of the great numbers of ſuch, yet the Miniſter cannot know them. He that knoweth not their faces, much leſs ever catechized half. And commonly children and ignorant people will

ſay

ſay the words of the Creed and Lord's Prayer, when they are groſly ignorant of the ſenſe. 2. And if the Miniſter know ſuch an one to be ſo groſly ignorant, the Law giveth him not power to deny him the Sacrament.

IX. How ſhould the Miniſter have power to excommunicate one out of a particular Church, when his Pariſh is not a particular Church, but a part of a Dioceſan Church only? It's known, now it is maintained by Biſhops, That the Dioceſan is the particular Church; That it is no Church that hath not a Biſhop of its own: That *Eccleſia eſt plebs Epiſcopo adunata*; and therefore the name of Paſtor is uſually appropriated to the Biſhop; and in moſt places of the Liturgy where *Biſhops*, *Paſtors* and *Curates* were joyntly named, one of the two firſt is put out of the New Book, and only Biſhops and Curates, or Paſtors and Curates mentioned: And who can caſt out of a Church, that is no Church in the Rulers ſenſe?

X. I have had many Pariſhioners that have made me know that they take me for none of their Paſtor, nor will do; nor themſelves for any of my Flock; and yet to ſatisfie the Law, or fame, or humour, they will demand the Sacrament. A Miniſter cannot refuſe ſuch a one, but muſt do the one part of a Paſtor's Office to them that diſclaim the relation.

XI. If I upon ſtrong ſuſpicion of groſs Ignorance, would deſire my neighbours (aged or young) to come and ſpeak with me, and would try them and inſtruct them; or if I deſire to confer with them on a juſt private ſuſpicion of Hereſie or Atheiſm, or accuſation or fame of wicked

living

living; and if they refuse to speak with me, or give me any answer or account, but shut their doors against me, and bid me meddle with my own business, I have no power to refuse them the Sacrament.

XII. I have known many persons, that for fear of being guilty of the body and blood of Christ, would be in danger of desperation or distraction, should they receive it: Yet if, for fear of an Excommunication, such unwilling ones come, I must give it them. And I know too many that let me know, that though they will have the Sacrament, they do not consent to the Essentials of the Sacramental Covenant, but think Christ's terms too hard (till they have sinned longer;) yet these must I admit to the Sacrament.

XIII. On the other side, I must give it none that dare not take it kneeling, nor any that think Conformity unlawful, nor that the Canon calleth Schismaticks.

XIV. I must give it to none of the most worthy of my Flock, whom the Bishop or Lay-Chancellor will excommunicate, if it be but for not paying fees, or not appearing at his Court.

XV. The Priest must publish the Chancellor's or Bishop's Excommunication, if against the most conscionable of his Flock.

XVI. And he must publish the Chancellor's or Bishop's Absolution, though he know the party to be most unworthy.

XVII. He hath no power to judge whom to take into the Church by Baptism, but must Baptize any Child of Atheists, Brutists, Heathens, Infidels or Hereticks, that have but God-fathers, who ne-

ver

ver take them for their own, though his conſcience be againſt it, as is aforeſaid.

XVIII. He hath no power to forbear pronouncing Abſolution from all ſin in abſolute terms, to any ſick man that will ſay he repenteth, and deſire it, though by never ſo much evidence the Prieſt judge it to be either counterfeit, or from meer attrition or fear, without love.

XIX. I have proved that he hath no power to forbear pronouncing all Atheiſts, Infidels, Brutiſts, Adulterers, Drunkards, worldlings, &c. ſaved, at their Burial, except the unbaptized, excommunicate and ſelf-murderers.

XX. In a word, the Prieſt is ſo far from having the power of excommunicating out of a particular Church, that he hath no power to do the neceſſary previous acts. 1. If he would tell him his fault privately, the ſinner may refuſe to ſpeak with him, as is ſaid. 2. If he would take two or three witneſſes, he may refuſe yet to ſpeak with him, or hear him. 3. If he would tell the Church where he hath Communion, and would publickly admoniſh him before them all, and pray for him by name, that he may repent, he doth more than he can anſwer, and the man may have his Action againſt him accordingly at Law.

XXI. If a Miniſter will proſecute at the Biſhops Court all that he hath cauſe to keep from the Sacrament (as he muſt do within fourteen daies) 1. It will take him off all his Miniſterial ſtudies almoſt, in many great and wicked Pariſhes. It will be work enough to travel long journeys as an Informer. 2. It will ſpend all his Benefice, in the charge of journeys, Proctors, and bringing witneſſes

nesses so far. 3. He shall but get the hatred of sinners, and never be like more to do them good: Whereas, had he power to use true Pastoral Discipline with them, his love and tenderness might possibly melt them into repentance, which a Chancellor's Court, so like a Civil Judicature, and putting them to great expences and danger, is unlike to do. Nor did I ever in my whole life know one sinner brought to Repentance seemingly serious, by their Courts.

XXII. To conclude, If the Minister have power to keep any from the Sacrament for fourteen daies, till he prosecute them, they will as members, have all other Communion with that Church even in Prayer, Praise and Thanksgiving, and the Baptizing of his Child, &c. *Albaspineus* (that great and notable describer of the Churches Customs) tells us, that the Old Excommunication did shut them out of all other Church-Communion, as well as the Sacrament; even their oblations were not accepted.

If I understand the Case of the Parish-Priests, and their Power of Discipline, this is it. And is this the Power of the Keys or Excommunication?

If you ask me, How I would have all this remedied; I have oft enough answered it, and will not here repeat it. Only I would have a Minister have some such freedom as a School-master or Philosopher hath in his School; and not a meer slave or Agent of others, to take in and use, and exclude and say, as strangers to the Flock command him, against his conscience and knowledge of the Case; till it be proved, that it shall justifie him at judgment for all such actions, to say, The Law, Bishop or Chancellor commanded me.

§ 2. You

§ 2. You tell us as by your many Years Experience, that private repelling by Counſel and Perſuaſion, may ſerve with moſt. And 1. I wonder that you that had but a ſmall Country Chappel and no Church at all, where near Neighbours might eaſily be ſpoken with, ſhould talk of your Experience as an argument againſt that which is of notorious matter of Fact. 1. Shew me where Law, Canon, or Rubrick, giveth power to the Prieſt to refuſe a Pariſhioner that ſaith, [I take you not for my Paſtor, nor to have any authority over me, but as the Biſhop's Curate, to do what the Law bids you, and I will not ſpeak with you.] 2. Do you not now dwell in *London*? where Pariſhes are ſo great that the Parſon can do no ſuch thing on one of a Multitude, nor doth ſo much as know them? And know you not that *de facto*, there are Multitudes that will refuſe, and ſcorn to give you any account, or hear you, or come to you, or admit you to any ſuch diſcourſe with them? I had the moſt obedient tractable People to deal with that ever I knew: And yet I had ſome that attempted by preſent violence to Murder me, for Admoniſhing them, and forbidding them the Sacrament; and many that would give me no other account of themſelves, but demand of me to deliver them the Sacrament as the Canon and Liturgy order it, whenever they appear at Church and require it: Hundreds and Thouſands will ſtoop to no other Terms in the great Pariſhes of *England*.

§ 3. I confeſs, if ever I had been thought tolerable under our Prelates, and had thought my ſelf able (as I do not) for the care of ſome of

But you ſay, *It is the Intention of the Law that you perform.*

Anſ. You have proved me alſo, and all of us, Conformiſts, before we were aware. The *end of the Law is to edifie and ſave Men, and to prefer Mercy before Sacrifice: But all this I do, or endeavour in my Preaching, Dwelling, and Practice:* Ergo, *I am a Conformiſt, and perform the Law.* But that did not keep me out of the common Gaol, nor ſave my Library. And muſt we be puniſhed for Conforming? Break the Law and Canon, and ſay you did it in Mercy and kept it, and try whether you will paſs for a Conformiſt? Did you not thus keep the end of the Law when you Preacht at *Warrington*? and did your Excommunicators call it Conformity?

§ 6. But you ſay, *All that are accuſed are not Excommunicate, nor laid in Gaols; it is to be hoped that the Ordinary will do them Juſtice.*

Anſ. 1. As they did you. 2. They may eſcape the Gaol by flying their Country, as you do: But what ſhall they do with their Wives and Children? 3. But we grant you all this: If 500 in a great Pariſh ſhould be accuſed by the Miniſter as uncapable of the Sacrament by groſs Ignorance, Infidelity, Hereſie, or Crimes, and as you ſay, they be not Excommunicate; when they come home acquit, the Miniſter muſt give them the Sacrament the next time. 4. But our queſtion is not what the *Ordinary will do*, but what the Law and Canon bind him and you to do?

CHAP. XXI.

§ 1. YOu entitle the next Section, of the Chancellor and his Office, and reading Excommunications, and the Order and Diſcipline in the Church of *England*. And, 1. You tell us of them that would have Unordained Ruling Elders in every Pariſh. But, 1. If that be ill, how will it juſtifie Lay-Chancellors? 2. Cannot many with the Paſtor better govern one Pariſh, than one Chancellor can many Scores, or Hundreds? 3. Some give Lay-Elders only a part of the Magiſtrates work, and ſome only to be Delegates for the People to do but what they may do, who cannot be oft preſent, and to be occaſional Arbitrators; and ſome that give them any uſe of the Keys, take them not for Lay-men, but Miniſters ſeparated to that Eccleſiaſtical Office?

§ 2. You tell us of thirteen parts of Diſcipline among us: To which I ſaid enough before. 1. No Atheiſts, Infidels, or Pagans then muſt be refuſed Baptiſm, if communicating God-Fathers (how bad ſoever) preſent him who never take him for their own, and we doubt can neither give or prove his Title: And that we are diſabled to keep the unworthy from the Communion, I have proved; and the Excellent, Learned, Pious, Pariſh Prieſts of *London*, tell you by Practice.

2. Few Communicants are Confirmed, and Sacramental Capacity is not required to Confirmation: And if it be not uſed, or worſe, by Biſhops

the ſmaller Pariſhes, I ſhould have moſt truſted to the New Liturgy for my power to keep away ſome of the groſly Ignorant [*as being not ready to be Confirmed,*] becauſe they know not the Catechiſm. But now I perceive by you, this were not like to ſerve my turn; for you ſay, [It is only for thoſe that *never yet Communicated,*] when as multitudes of the Aged are groſly ignorant of the Eſſentials that have long Communicated. 2. And divers of theſe groſly ignorant Perſons are Confirmed long ago. Biſhop *Morton* was one of the Learnedſt and beſt Biſhops, that ever I knew: And when I was fourteen or fifteen Years old, I and my School-fellows, and abundance of Boys and Girls, when he came into the Country, went as to ſome Spectacle, and without any certificate, or queſtion to us, or inſtruction of us, we all kneeled in a long row in a Church-yard, in the Path-way, and as he went by, he laid his Hands on every one, and huddled over a ſhort Collect, of which I ſcarce underſtood one ſentence that he ſaid; and I was never the wiſer, nor fitter for the Sacrament that I perceived.

§ 4. But you ſay, that [*The Order binds to a Repelling by publick Admonition and Church Power notifying to the Congregation, ſuch a Man's Crimes and Scandals, as a Fornicator,* &c. *and warn him not to come to the Sacrament, till he have made open confeſſion of his Sins, and reformed his Life.*]

Anſ. What *Order* is it that *binds us to this?* If you mean *Chriſt's Order*, we muſt do it: If you mean the Churches, where ſhall we find it? This is like the Rubrick new Article of Faith, which will Silence us all who are not *certain by God's Word,*

Word, that Baptized Infants (without exception) are *undoubtedly ſaved*; and yet that Charity was wanting that ſhould but once have cited the Text that maketh it *undoubtedly certain*. A ſhort labour for ſo great an End. So when you might know how very far it would go to reconcile me to our Prelacy, could I but prove what here you ſay, yet you will not ſo much as tell me where to find it: Nay, if you that have ſtudied the Law, would but have told me how to eſcape, when I am accuſed for doing it.

§ 5. But your next is too apt to provoke Laughter, viz. [" *Suppoſe you honeſtly tell the* " *Ordinary, that the uncapable are too many to* " *be preſented, leſt Violence make them worſe, and* " *Excommunicating them ſignifie nothing, but en-* " *danger them to riſe in Rebellion, or Mutiny, and* " *turn you and us out of Place* (that reaſon is con- " ſiderable) *or quite leave our Aſſemblies, and turn* " Quakers, Papiſts, Infidels, *and precipitate Souls* " *to Hell by Obſtinacy and Viciouſneſs: But if you* " *will leave it to me, I will Chriſten their Children* " *and keep them within the Church*; (Is that Ex- " communicating them?) *as Hearers, and Lear-* " *ners, and Candidates*, &c. *Do I not then honeſtly* " *perform the Law?*

Anſ. Your honeſty I ſhall commend. And Chriſt's Law you may much perform. But what Law of the Church is it that you thus perform? What is the Law that giveth you any ſuch power? What Law forbids it you, I have ſhewed. Let the Rejected ſue you, and let the Judges tell you, whether you have kept the Law: The iſſue will anſwer you better than I can.

But you ſay, *It is the Intention of the Law that you perform.*

Anſ. You have proved me alſo, and all of us, Conformiſts, before we were aware. The *end of the Law is to edifie and ſave Men, and to prefer Mercy before Sacrifice: But all this I do, or endeavour in my Preaching, Dwelling, and Practice:* Ergo, *I am a Conformiſt, and perform the Law.* But that did not keep me out of the common Gaol, nor ſave my Library. And muſt we be puniſhed for Conforming? Break the Law and Canon, and ſay you did it in Mercy and kept it, and try whether you will paſs for a Conformiſt? Did you not thus keep the end of the Law when you Preacht at *Warrington*? and did your Excommunicators call it Conformity?

§ 6. But you ſay, *All that are accuſed are not Excommunicate, nor laid in Gaols; it is to be hoped that the Ordinary will do them Juſtice.*

Anſ. 1. As they did you. 2. They may eſcape the Gaol by flying their Country, as you do: But what ſhall they do with their Wives and Children? 3. But we grant you all this: If 500 in a great Pariſh ſhould be accuſed by the Miniſter as uncapable of the Sacrament by groſs Ignorance, Infidelity, Hereſie, or Crimes, and as you ſay, they be not Excommunicate; when they come home acquit, the Miniſter muſt give them the Sacrament the next time. 4. But our queſtion is not what the *Ordinary will do*, but what the Law and Canon bind him and you to do?

CHAP. XXI.

§ 1. YOu entitle the next Section, of the Chancellor and his Office, and reading Excommunications, and the Order and Diſcipline in the Church of *England*. And, 1. You tell us of them that would have Unordained Ruling Elders in every Pariſh. But, 1. If that be ill, how will it juſtifie Lay-Chancellors? 2. Cannot many with the Paſtor better govern one Pariſh, than one Chancellor can many Scores, or Hundreds? 3. Some give Lay-Elders only a part of the Magiſtrates work, and ſome only to be Delegates for the People to do but what they may do, who cannot be oft preſent, and to be occaſional Arbitrators; and ſome that give them any uſe of the Keys, take them not for Lay-men, but Miniſters ſeparated to that Eccleſiaſtical Office?

§ 2. You tell us of thirteen parts of Diſcipline among us: To which I ſaid enough before. 1. No Atheiſts, Infidels, or Pagans then muſt be refuſed Baptiſm, if communicating God-Fathers (how bad ſoever) preſent him who never take him for their own, and we doubt can neither give or prove his Title: And that we are diſabled to keep the unworthy from the Communion, I have proved; and the Excellent, Learned, Pious, Pariſh Prieſts of *London*, tell you by Practice.

2. Few Communicants are Confirmed, and Sacramental Capacity is not required to Confirmation: And if it be not uſed, or worſe, by Biſhops

who only have the power, what ſatisfaction is that to the Pariſh Prieſt and Church?

3. There is no ſufficient means to Convict, and keep away ſcandalous Sinners.

4. The Sinner hath power to forbid you private Admonition by refuſing to ſpeak with you, or come near you.

5. What is Family Power to the Church? We thank you for nothing. But were not Parents formerly diſabled from keeping Children and Servants from ſpending much of the Lord's Day in Dancing? *&c.* And doth not the Canon yet diſable them from bringing them to hear a Sermon at the next Pariſh Church, when they have none at Home?

6. The Lawyers that I ſpeak with, take all for meer Falſhood that you ſay of the Prieſts power, of publick admonition of ſinners by name, not cenſured by the Ordinary. You ſay, Where is it forbidden? I ask you, Where is the Prieſt authorized to do it? If not, the Man will have his Action againſt him, and Ruine him; and the Biſhop may ſuſpend him for Uſurpation. And, 2. Of all the worthy Pariſh Incumbents in *London*, who did you ever hear once do it? I never heard one do it, nor heard of one that did it in my life, except a Non-conformiſt, or a hot Parſon point at a Puritan in the Church for ſome Non-conformity in a Circumſtance. Reverſe then your charge of Hypocriſie, if you find it muſt fall on all the worthy *London* Incumbents: For they *all* ſpeak for Diſcipline, though not for more.

7. If there be half as many bad Miniſters as the Country ſaith there is, it's a ſmall honour to the

the Church, to reproach the Fathers that admit them as ſinning againſt Church, Law, and Conſcience; and a ſmall relief to Peoples Souls to tell that ſome Body had power to have provided better. But the People had no ſuch power, to ſave themſelves from a bad one; though the Church for 700, if not more Years, took him to be no Biſhop but an Uſurper, that came not in by the conſent of the Flock, and election of the Clergy, of which more elſewhere.

8. Do or can Biſhops by Viſitations know the People and their Caſes of a thouſand, or many hundred Pariſhes, ſo as to hear and judge them? Would they not have ten thouſand ſcandalous Sinners ſometime to try and exhort to Repentance in one, or few Days?

9. and 10. We are glad that the old prohibitions of Afternoon Sermons and Lectures, are not yet revived: But how few Pariſhes have ſuch Lectures comparatively? and how few have Catechizing? And they that have none, may not go to another: If you think that it will ſave the Peoples Souls, that the Prieſt might have inſtructed them if he could and would, and that the Biſhop ſhould have made him do it, I diſſent.

11. I have ſeen no Viſitation Articles of late, but in the old ones of 1634, 1635, 36, 37, 38, 39. the Church-wardens were to ſwear to perſecute Men for ſo many things which they thought their Duty (as the foreſaid going from a Non-preaching Miniſter, keeping private Faſts, and ſuch like) that many Men that feared an Oath and Perſecution, ſuffered becauſe they durſt not be Church-wardens.

12. I

12. I confeſs more manners of Church-cenſures are in uſe among us, than we deſire. The Canons will tell them to you: Elſe ſo many hundred Non-Conformiſts formerly and lately had not been forbid to Preach, nor all forbid to admit Non-conforming Chriſtians to Communion; nor had they been *ipſo facto* excommunicate (though *Ant. de Dom. Spalatenſis* ſay ſo much to make odious all excommunicating *ipſo facto* (who, they ſay, firſt deviſed the name of a Doctrinal Penitence.) And Biſhop *Jer. Taylor* ſaith ſo much againſt it.

And I confeſs that there is the Magiſtrate's ſword to back all this; by which about two thouſand of us were ſilenced, and you fly out of your Country from the Writ *de excommunicato capiendo.*

§ 3. My belief of your unfeigned honeſty makes one at laſt *pity* you, and *wonder* when you add [*What more would you have?*] what it was that could tempt you to contract the guilt of defending things of ſuch publick and ſad an Aſpect and proſpect, againſt ſuch light, and after ſuch experience of the effects, and in ſuch a time! 1. Do you believe in your conſcience, that the Biſhop of *York*, *Norwich*, *Lincoln*, *London*, or the reſt, with a Chancellor, and his Officials and Arch-Deacons, can poſſibly exerciſe that Diſcipline, or the hundredth part of it, which Chriſt hath appointed, were they never ſo honeſt? 2. Do you believe that a Lay-Chancellor, who you confeſs hath not the power of the Keys, doth or can well execute them? 3. Do you not know how little of the Pariſh-Government againſt ſcandals is exerciſed by the Biſhop; and how almoſt is done by this Chancellor and

and Officials? 4. Do you not know how unlike their Courts are to fit a ſinner for abſolution by true Repentance? 5. Did you ever in your life know a ſinner brought to a repentance ſeemingly unfeigned by them? 6. Did you ever hear ſuch worthy men of greateſt honeſty and Learning as Dr. *Lloyd*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Tillotſon*, Mr. *Sharp*, &c. name any in the Pulpit or Church by way of publick admonition and invitation to repentance, who was not firſt cenſured by the Ordinary? 7. Do you think none of them would do it, if they thought it a duty, and the lawful and ſafe way of Diſcipline? 8. Do you think their Pariſhes have no ſcores or hundreds of Brutiſts, Atheiſts, Drunkards, Fornicators, or other ſcandalous ſinners? 9. Do you think they can poſſibly know any thing of their peoples groſs Ignorance, Infidelity, Atheiſm, yea, or Scandal, who can know ſo few of the perſons? (much leſs can the Biſhop.) 10. Do you think that it is exerciſe enough of this Diſcipline, when about 5000 in a year only communicate to leave 20000 or 30000 more, as members of the Church in that Pariſh, that uſe not to communicate, or elſe may come when they will extraordinarily to ſave them from the Law, though utterly unknown to the Miniſter? (And ſo proportionably in Pariſhes half as big.) And how is it poſſible this can be amended *rebus ſic ſtantibus*? And would not ſo many good men amend it, were it poſſible? Oh draw not the guilt of ſo many and ſuch things on your ſelf without cauſe! Were it as ſmall a thing as the *Iſraelites High Places*, if you cannot amend it, do not become the open defender of it. *Judas* himſelf at laſt accuſed the Phariſees and

and High Prieſts, and juſtified Chriſt. I do not think he would have written a Confutation of Chriſt's reproofs, recited in *Matt.* 15. and 23, *&c.* How can you pray for a Reformation of that which you think needeth none? And hath the Church and Cauſe of holy Diſcipline loſt ſo much of your prayers too? If you ſay to God, as you do to us, [*What more would we have?*] I am glad that God hath a firmer people that will pray for more.

§ 4. You ſay [*As to the Chancellor and his Office, it is leſs matter by whom Excommunication be done, ſo it be honeſtly and ſoundly done. He is a Chriſtian; he is a man of Knowledge and Learning; he is authorized by the Laws of the Kingdom; his Office is incorporate into the Government of the Nation. Though he may not bind and looſe as a Paſtor, he may as a Chriſtian, authorized by the King.* See *Matth.* 18. 15, *&c.*

Anſ. This is a great buſineſs. 1. Why ſaid you before, that the Power of the Keys belongs to the Paſtors, *&c?* But you meant [*not only to them.*] 2. Is it the ſame ſort of Excommunication and Abſolution which belongs to the Paſtor and to a Layman? If not, you ſay nothing to our buſineſs. For our Laws, Canons and Church pretend here no difference. I confeſs that there are three acts of ſeparation, which the Magiſtrate may do. 1. He may command Biſhops and Paſtors to do their Office faithfully in excommunicating notorious impenitent criminals. 2. When they are excommunicated, he may forbid them intruding into the Church. 3. He may judge the flagitious to be ſtigmatized, or be taken as out-lawed, and forbid men to be familiar with them. But

But the Power of the Church is a power of judging what individual perſons are fit or unfit for Baptiſm, the Euchariſt, Church Entrance, and Church Communion, is the Church is the Porch of Heaven, and as a preparation to the final judgment. And it is not another ſort, but this ſort which the Lay-Chancellor pretendeth to exerciſe in the Biſhop's name.

I have been thought by ſome to give my ſelf too much to Magiſtrates in Church-matters: But I am far from your mind, for the reaſons following.

1. It is notorious, that in Scripture Chriſt hath inſtituted a ſpecial Office to uſe theſe Keys, and do this work, which he would not have done, had he left it common to any others.

2. The Power of the Keys is ſo much of the eſſential comprehenſive title of that Office, as that it is nullified when it is made common.

3. If this part may be done by the Lay-men or Magiſtrate, no man can give a reaſon why any of the reſt may not, even not only to be the ſtated Teachers of the Church, and their Guides in Worſhip, but alſo Baptizing and adminiſtring the Lord's Supper. As it is more to be the Law-makers than the Cryers, and the Judge, than the Marſhal; ſo it is more to decree who ſhall have the Sacraments, than barely to deliver it them, which the Deacon may do. And ſo we ſhall have not only Lay-Baptizers, but Lay-Preachers, Lay-Adminiſters of the Lord's Supper, or by contradiction, *Lay-Prieſts.*

4. You plead for Conformity, and may eaſily know that the Church of *England* abhorreth this Opinion.

5. When

5. When King *Henry* the Eighth was called *Head of the Church*, to avoid the Papists calumnies, Queen *Elizabeth* and King *James* have published their disclaiming of that power of Word and Sacraments, called that of the Keys; and if my Ears deceived me not, I have heard our present King profess the same.

6. The judgment and practice of the Churches of all Ages and places since Christ, is against you; I think *Helvetia* it self not excepted. And should this be nothing to you, who call on us to reverence the Old Conformists?

7. The reason of the Institution fully satisfies me. It was not meet so great a trust should be placed in unfit men: As in case of Ordination, it must be men that are able to try the persons, as to skill and life, that must be trusted with so weighty a business; and also such that can have leisure to attend it; and therefore as an Office are empowered for it, and separated to it, lest it miscarry; so as to Baptism, Absolution, Excommunication, it must be done by men, 1. That are capable of full acquaintance with the person, witnesses and cause. 2. And that can try and judge of it. 3. And especially of the persons *Faith* and *Repentance*; (for it is on these that the sentence must pass:) No Baptism without Faith: No Excommunication without obstinate Impenitence: No Absolution without Repentance.) 4. It must be by men fit to exhort them to *Faith* and *Repentance*, and confute their Errours, and pray for them that God would give them Faith and Repentance. 5. And it is so great a part of the world, and all the Church of Christ, that this, or much of this must be done for, that

that reaſon ſhewed it needful, that it be made the work of a great and ſpecial Office. And if ſo, then thoſe men that do it, 1. Muſt be tryed as Ordained Miniſters be: 2. And Ordained to the Office of doing it: 3. And profeſs to do it as ſuch Officers: 4. And not lacerate that Office, and change it, by taking a part of it, and leaving the reſt: And ſo they muſt be no Lay-men.

I could wiſh that you had ſtudied and conſulted better, before with ſuch more than *Eraſtian* ſingularity you had pleaded for ſo dangerous a thing as Church-Levelling, or ſo much overthrow of the neceſſary ſacred Office, and ſet your ſelf againſt the judgment and practice of the Chriſtian Church. But all men have their hour of temptation; and all do not overcome.

§ 5. You ſay, *The Excommunication is of no force till publiſhed by the Pariſh-Miniſter, who hath power, if he pleaſe, to make it his Text, and declare the nature, uſe and ends*, &c.

Anſ. 1. I had rather have a better Text. 2. It is of force if another publiſh it. 3. It's part of the true Charge of the Miniſter himſelf, and will, truſting another with it, diſcharge him. 4. We fear being guilty of the Lay-man's Uſurpation, and the Church-Confuſion. 5. But worſt of all, it is people fearing God that the Canon excommunicateth *ipſo facto*, and that the Chancellor is to excommunicate. Had it been my duty to pronounce you excommunicate, becauſe the Chancellor decreed it? 6. Where you ſay, *If I know the ſentence to be void, unjuſt and illegal, I am not to publiſh it.*

Anſ. Well ſet together. But if you know it to be

be *unjuſt*, and yet *legal*, according to the Canon, you muſt publiſh it, or be a Non-Conformiſt, and may be ſuſpended: And are all the Canons Decrees juſt?

CHAP. XXII.

YOU ſpeak next of the Surplice; of which I gave you no occaſion. But we that know that the true meaning of the Liturgy is, that all muſt uſe it that ſhall be ſuffered to officiate, 1. Will not believe you, if you tell us the contrary hereafter, and lay it only on the Canon, and think it nothing that you are obliged to conſent to, and approve. 2. Nor will I yet believe that you will undertake to juſtifie the ejecting and ſilencing of all that dare not uſe the Surplice: Or if you will, you cannot. The 14th and 15th of the *Romans* cannot be confuted; nor the many proofs that I have given, that it reacheth our caſe, in my late Book for the *Church's Concord*. And why talk you of the Surplice, and omit the main Queſtion, Whether we may conſent to the Liturgy, Preface and Rubrick, which impoſe it as they do? You durſt not conſent to ſilence two thouſand, or one that dare not uſe it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

§ 1. YOur next Section is of the falſe Rule for finding *Eaſter-Day*. To this you ſay, [*If really there be an Error, I aſſent not to it.*] *Anſ.* Nor I: Nor will I ſay I do when I do not. And to what purpoſe then do you write for Conformity, when one Lye muſt not be told to ſave our Liberty?

§ 2. But you ſay, *It is not an Error in Divinity. Anſ.* What then? May I Lye about any other things?

§ 3. But you ſay, *Some yet continue to affirm it is no Error. Anſ.* And what will not ſome Men affirm? You ſee how hard it is for a Non-conformiſt to be juſtified with ſome Men, when all the *Almanacks* in *England* cannot do it in ſuch a point. I am too weak to deal with Men, that will not take ſuch evidence as this.

You ſay, *That it is queſtionable, whether this be any part of the Book to be aſſented to. Anſ.* You had ſome fair pretence to deny the act of Uniformity to be a part, though the Contents ſay it is, but if this be queſtionable, you may queſtion (as the School-Men) ſo long till you leave us little unqueſtionable. This would increaſe my Reſolution againſt Conformity, when we cannot be ſure what it is that we muſt Aſſent and Conſent to, and what not: How can you tell us which is or not of the Book, if this be not?

§ 4. You ſay, [*For the time paſt none will lay it to the charge of the Conformiſts, and for the time*

to come it will be abated, thoſe that ſhall Subſcribe and Conform.]

Anſ. How oft have I told you, that I am laying nothing to the Charge of others, but excuſing our ſelves? But I cannot juſtifie them that will do they know not what. Eſpecially it is ſad that, when ſuch a Convocation which is the Repreſentative Church of *England*, ſhall all conſent to draw up ſuch things to be impoſed on a Kingdom; and ſo great a Parliament require aſſent to it on the Penalties enacted and executed on ſo many, they ſhould have no more honourable a defence than you make for them.

§ 5. And who it is that hath the power to abate us that which the Law ſo ſeverely requireth, we do not yet know, unleſs it be the King, whoſe Mind you know not. It is the Biſhop that you mean: But I doubt the Lawyers that have ſo lately queſtioned the Kings Power of Diſpenſation, will contradict you that give that to the Biſhop which they deny the King.

CHAP. XXIV.

§ 1. THe next Section is about our Aſſenting to, Conſenting to, and approving the many Diſorders and Defects in the Liturgy. You confeſs there are ſuch, and name many of them. And the ſum of your Anſwer is, That you *Aſſent and Conſent to uſe the formes though diſordered and defective, and the Aſſent and Conſent is no otherwiſe to be underſtood.*

Anſ. Soon ſaid, but where's the proof? 1. The words

words are, *All things contained in, and preſcribed by the Book.* Is the mode and diſorder none of the [*All?*] If I ſhould ſay, I *Approve*, *Aſſent*, and *Conſent* to *ſomething but not all*; or the *Matter*, but not the Order and Manner, doth this anſwer the common ſenſe of the univerſal words? What if the Book did ſay the Lord's Prayer, or Ten Commandments backward, or Baptized in the Name of the Holy Ghoſt, the Son, and the Father, or began as it ends, *&c.* may I declare that I Conſent to, and approve all things contained in it, and preſcribed by it?

§ 2. As to your limitation of the ſenſe to the word *Uſe*, I have told you that the Parliament rejected it, and that it is a groundleſs Fiction, and that it makes your Cauſe no whit the better were it granted.

CHAP. XXV.

§ 1. THE next is, Whether we may aſſent to the Preface for juſtifying all that was in the Book before.

You ſay that *It was not the intent of the Book to bind any Man to approve the Errors of Tranſlators and Printers, nor to uſe the Forms in the Liturgy ſo as to contradict one another.*

Anſ. 1. Printers Errors indeed are not the Convocations, nor the Books as made by them: Did I inſtance in any of them. But if Tranſlators Errors alſo be excepted, our difficulty of underſtanding the Impoſition ſtill increaſeth. Then it ſeems as to the Pſalms, Epiſtles and Goſpels, we

Aſſent and Conſent only to the Original Text, and ſo much as we judge well Tranſlated. I thought if the Book by ill Tranſlation had groſly contradicted, or depraved the Scripture, it had been one of the worſt ſort of Errors. I told you where it directly contradicteth the Text. What Hereſie may not be brought in by a falſe Tranſlation? We thank God for the worſt, as a great Mercy to the Church; and by them that will not receive a better in the *Pſalms*, we are thus commanded to juſtifie even that which was worſt, leſt they ſhould be thought to have needed any amendment. And you make your ſelf their Expoſitor without their Authority, and tell us that the intent of the Book is not to bind us to approve the Errors of Tranſlators: And I believe you as the Book is diſtinguiſhed from the Authors, and ſo hath no intent at all. But if the Tranſlator hath done, as *Heylin* ſaith the King's Printer did, that put [*Thou ſhalt commit Adultery*,] for [*Thou ſhalt not*,] and I were commanded to approve of *all things contained in the Book*; whatever you ſhall ſay or do, I would have done as *John Fox* the Martyrologiſt did, ſaith *Heylin*, who brought a Greek Teſtament (ſuppoſing the *Hebrew* old Teſtament) and ſaid to them, [*I am ready to ſubſcribe this: If that will not ſerve your turn, take my Prebendſhip of* Salisbury, *which is all the Preferment that ever I had of you, and much good may it do you.*]

§ 2. And you tell us without proof, that when at *Chriſtmas* we are bid ſay [*As on this day Chriſt was born*] for divers Days, it intends not that we ſhall uſe the words [*this Day*,] but on one

one Day (and so at *Whitsuntide*, &c.) That is, It expresly imposeth the very words that we shall read, forbidding us by the Canon to alter or diminish, and yet it meaneth not that we should use them. May you not then say what you list, which you think should have been commanded you, and suppose it the meaning of the Command? You say, *This is but a favourable interpretation:* You should have said truly, [*It was their oversight, which if they had seen they had amended.*] And I do not say that they meant amiss: But if they speak amiss, and our humble Prelates that are *Servi servorum Dei*, come after them, and command me on pain of Silence to *Assent, Consent* to, and *Approve* the *words*, they shall take my Liberty and Life if they will; but I will not *Approve* them. It is *all things* in the *Book* that *we* must *Consent to*, whatever was in their Minds. If they bid me Approve the saying, that [*Christ's Body and Blood is really present, under the forms of Bread and Wine,*] and mean as well by it as *Cousins, Heylin*, &c. did, I will not Approve it, though you should. Though *Luther de Conciliis, & Dav. Derodon* say, that *Nestorius* meant soundly, yet the Councils condemned him for a Heretick, and owned not his words, whatever he meant.

§ 3. But you say, [*It is not that the old Book was faultless, but that They were fully persuaded in their judgments that it was so.*]

Ans. You think this but a [*favourable Interpretation*] too. But by your leave, [*If they had said that we are fully persuaded in our judgment, that the Council of* Trent *hath nothing contrary to*

the Word of God,] and then required me to declare my *Assent* and *Consent to all things contained in that Book*, I should not have done it. If you understand the words so, others will not.

CHAP. XXVI.

§ 1. YOu next undertake to prove, that the Act of Uniformity is no part of the Book to be Consented to. The Contents say it is: You say it is not. Are these Contents part of the Book? If so, Then they are false: If not, How shall we know what is or is not part of the Book? Your Proofs are no Proofs.

1. You say, *The Act it self nameth the Book as distinct from the Law. Ans.* And what then? No more followeth but that the word [*Book*] is sometime taken in the full sense, and sometime more narrowly. So the Body is oft distinguished from the Head, and the *Kingdom* from the *King*: Will you therefore infer that the *Head* is no part of the *Body*, nor the King of the Kingdom, fully taken? The *Preface* is usually distinguished from the Book, and so is the *Index*, or *Contents*, *Margin*, *Title*, &c. And yet Preface, Index, Contents, Title, Margin of the Book, are all parts of the Book. Your second Proof is of the same sort.

§ 2. Your third saith, *The Book must rather* (if either) *be a part of the Act, because it is subjoined.* Would you by this rate of Argument convince us? Is the Book part of the *Preface*, or *Contents*, or *Index*, if *these go first?* Is the House part of the Porch, or the Porch part of the House?

Is

Is the Body part of the Head? or the Kingdom part of the King? or the Family part of the Porter?

But you ſay, *It is abſurd to ſay that the thing to which the Appendix is annexed, is part of the Appendix.* It is ſo; therefore ſay not ſo your ſelf. But is not the *Appendix part of the Book?* And doth the Acts, being placed firſt, make it no Appendix? And were it put in the end, were it not the ſame thing?

§ 3. Your Fourth is no better, *viz.* [" *The Old* " *Act of Uniformity is a declared part of the Con-* " *tents, and bound up with the Book; and if this* " *be part, we muſt ſubſcribe contradictions, to uſe* " *two Common-Prayer-Books.*

Anſ. Is that old Act, the old Book? Is ſubſcribing to that Act, ſubſcribing to the old Book? Why obtrude you on us ſuch things unproved? 2. Do you not know that the New Act not only confirmeth the Old, but alſo altereth the ſenſe of it, and tells you that henceforth it ſhall be underſtood, as meaning this New Book? And as Biſhop *Taylor* truly tells you, Laws are not the Laws of the dead, but of the living, who therefore give them what ſenſe they pleaſe. And yet ſhall ſo ſober a man tell us, That ſubſcribing the Old Act, is ſubſcribing the Old Book? I begin to be weary anſwering ſuch reaſonings as theſe.

§ 4. Your fifth and ſixth Reaſons are from the general ſenſe and opinion of all Divines, as for you: And you ſay, *Never any to this day did think that the 36th Canon and Subſcription included the Act.*

Anſ. You now practice what you plead for.

Can you tell what every Subſcriber to this day thought? He is yet living that at the *Savoy* undertook to prove it an Act of Mercy to them to put all from the Sacrament that did not receive it kneeling. And you know that All the Biſhops in the Lords Houſe had their part in making that Act of Uniformity, with all its penalties. And as certainly they did conſent to the making and impoſing of it; ſo what ſhould make you ſure that they never meant (no not one of them) that any others ſhould be bound to the ſame, when they put it into the Book, and put in the words [*All things contained*] and when it is ſo natural to ſuch men to deſire that all men approve of what they do? I ſhould think it ten to one, that they that think it their duty to do ſuch a thing, as the ſilencing of two thouſand Miniſters on thoſe terms (or five thouſand if they had not conformed,) will be very much concerned to have their act approved: And that they that will not endure us to ſpeak in the praying Desk, or at either Sacrament to God in any one word but what they write down for us to ſay, are likely to deſire that we may be alſo bound to approve of their Sanctions of this Law. But I am ſure you ſpeak that which you know not to be true.

§ 5. To your Seventh I anſwer, What would have plainer than the expreſs Aſſertion of the Contents themſelves?

§ 6. In your Eighth you ſay, [" *Many Conformable men think Nothing in the Book is to be* " *aſſented to, but what is ordinarily to be read,* " *and the Ceremonies to be uſed.*] *Anſ.* Put this down

down then as one point of our Nonconformity, which deſerveth ſilencing; and ruine that, when we cannot profeſs to [" *Aſſent and Conſent to all* " *things contained and preſcribed in the Book*] and mean by [*All things*, only the Ceremonies, and ſo much as is ordinarily to be *read.*] But again, teach not Papiſts to expound the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy at this rate.

§ 7. You ſay, 1. That the Title is no part of an Act of Parliament. 2. Nor any but the Mandatory is part of a Law.

Anſ. But you might have known that we will not believe you: Why then ſhould you thus put us off with your bare word? Though the word [*Law*] (as all words) be equivocally oft uſed, and taken for the chief part, yet as properly taken, and pertinently to our queſtion, we will yet believe whatever you ſay, 1. That the prefatory Reaſons, and the penal and premiant Sanctions, are parts of the *Act* and *Law.* 2. Yea, that the Title is part of the Act, if it be made and prefixed, and promulgate with it by the Legiſlators.

But I will tell you how you may know: If you openly deprave all the reſt of the Law or Book, and ſome one indict you for it, the Judge may ſatisfie you better than I can.

§ 8. But you are never ſo confident as where you are moſt overſeen. You ſay, *Our ſtrongeſt reaſon from the Contents doth moſt ſtrongly confute it ſelf.* This *Title* is not only part of your proof, but *all* that I can ſee. For that which you take for your proof, that [*Then the Old Act of Uniformity, and conſequently two Books, are conſented to, and our Governours ſpeak non-ſenſe*] is either worſe

worſe than *non-ſenſe*, or I underſtand not ſenſe from non-ſenſe. I have called before for your proof, that [*Two Acts are two Common-Prayer-Books*] when the latter eſtabliſheth the former expreſly, as binding only to the New Book! The words are [" *Be it enacted—That the ſeveral good* " *Laws and Statutes of this Realm, which have* " *been formerly made, and are now in force for the* " *Uniformity of Prayer*, &c. *ſhall ſtand in full* " *force and ſtrength, to all intents and purpoſes* " *whatſoever, for the eſtabliſhing and confirming of* " *the ſaid Book entitled*, &c. *herein before mention-* " *ed, and ſhall be applyed, practiſed, and put in uſe* " *for the puniſhing of all offences contrary to the* " *ſaid Laws, with relation to the Book aforeſaid,* " *and no other.*] And they have cauſed the Act of *Elizabeth*, to be bound with this Book, as it was with the Old: And doth this infer *two Books* from *two Acts*, &c? Alas Brother! that we ſhould trouble and wrong the world at this rate of unadviſed confidence. This old Canonical Subſcription is alſo continued; and yet it is here enacted, that it ſhall mean only this New Book, and no other.

You add, *If the Printer, or any other through overſight bind up the Apocrypha, and put in the Contents of the Holy Bible, is it a part of it?*

Anſ. 1. It is not the Printer's act, but the Law-maker's that we have to do with.

2. If the Law-maker cauſe the Printer to put the Apocrypha in the Bible, and call it a part of it in the Contents, I will ſay that he declareth it to be a part, though I believe him not. And I will call God's Word his Word, if *Æſop*'s Fables be

be bound with it; and I will ſubſcribe to God's Word. But if the Law-maker bind other Books with it, and in the Contents call them part of the Book, and then bid me declare Aſſent and Conſent to all things in that Book, I will not obey him.

CHAP. XXVII.

ABout declaring it *unlawful, on any pretence whatſoever, to take Arms by the King's Authority againſt any Commiſſioned by him.*

§ 1. Here you will prove (in your proving way) that it meaneth only [*againſt ſuch as be juſtly and legally commiſſioned in the due purſuance of their Commiſſion.*] Before I anſwer you, I will give you my reaſons for the contrary.

1. The Act of *Militia* ſeemeth to me to give another ſenſe of the whole matter: Read it and judge.

2. This Subſcription, and other like Profeſſions, were purpoſely impoſed for the renunciation of the late Parliament Arms. But in your ſenſe what will it have done to ſatisfie or oblige any man in that or the like caſe, when they profeſt the ſame thing, and ſaid, that it was only *unjuſt and unlawful Commiſſions*, and an *unlawful purſuit* that they reſiſted? Be their words true or falſe, this was their pretence, and they would in the heat of the War have ſubſcribed to what you ſay.

3. This was made and impoſed to keep men from the like for the time to come: But this would not keep them; for they would take it.

4. Are

4. Are you ignorant what ſtriving there hath been in Parliament to have got the word [*Lawfully or Legally*] commiſſioned in, and it could never be obtained? (ſave that not long ago it was carryed once in a Grand Committee of the Houſe of Lords only, very many years ſince this Act was made.) Some ſay *They had reaſon not to expreſs it, though they meant it, leſt it ſhould be abuſed.* I anſwer, Then they had reaſon to deſire not to be ſo underſtood. And then we cannot, nor ought not ſo to underſtand them againſt their wills; and the *non apparere*, and *non eſſe* of their ſenſe is all one to us.

5. They knew that it was this that would herein have ſatisfied diſſenters, and tended to the Concord which they profeſſed to deſire; and yet they would not yield to any ſuch limitation or expoſition.

6. There were ſuch Reaſons brought againſt your ſenſe as theſe in the Houſe. 1. No reſiſting Arms are lawful. 2. If Subjects be made Judges whether the King's Commiſſions be lawful or not, it it is no reſtraint of Rebellion at all. For it's as eaſie to ſay, *They are unlawful*, as to ſay, *We may reſiſt them though lawful*, and far more eaſie. Who will not pretend it?

7. *Non eſt limitandum aut diſtinguendum de lege ſine lege:* But in ſo great a buſineſs as this, do you think our Governours will not take it for a heinous thing, for ſuch as you or I to put in the word [*Lawful*] into *Subſcriptions* and *Oaths*, which ſo many great men did ſo long and deliberately ſtudy.

8. A Papiſt or Jeſuit will take it in your words; for he will ſay, That no Commiſſion againſt the Pope's Countermands, or his Authority, or Canons are lawful.

§ 2. Now

§ 2. Now to your proofs; 1. You ſay, [*The Act it ſelf implieth it; for elſe, what uſe is there for Laws and Parliaments? The King may do what he will: He is free to violate his Coronation Oath, and ſet up Arbitrary Government by a Law.*]

Anſ. Did you ever read Biſhop *Taylor* againſt Reſiſtance in his *Ductor Dubitant.* who deſpaireth of proving any thing in the world, if he cannot prove that? Have you read Dr. *Hearne*, Mr. *Digs*, *Mich. Hudſon*, Mr. *Welden*, Dr. *Arnway*, &c? you are anſwered by many.

1. That the King may not do any ſuch thing lawfully.

2. But if he do it, he is anſwerable only to God.

3. And that the Subject hath no remedy but prayers and tears. Yet it followeth not, ſay they, that Laws or Parliaments are vain: For by them the King governeth as far as he pleaſe, and they are his inſtruments.

§ 3. Your ſecond Reaſon is, *The calling in the the King's Indulgence, as contrary to Law, ſheweth it.*

Anſ. Did they that declared it contrary to Law, declare that men may reſiſt it by Arms?

§ 4. 3. You ſay, [*The Judges at* Weſtminſter *unanimouſly agree upon this ſenſe and expoſition of the Law, and their common practice no leſs.*]

Anſ. I will give you a Lawyer's Fee if you will prove it. When, and how did they ever declare any ſuch Agreement? What practice is it that you mean? Do they commonly reſiſt unlawfully Commiſſioned Souldiers by Arms? Or declare

declare for it. 2. But if this were true (which I believe not, whatever their ſecret judgment may be) it followeth not the Parliament which made this Law was of that mind. 3. Your aſſertion is raw (*"That the Judges are made the "publick Expoſitors of Laws, made by King and "Parliament.*) There are two ſorts of Expoſition of Laws: One is but limited to a particular Caſe and Perſon, in order to the applicatory Sentence for or againſt that Man: And ſo the Judges are Expoſitors. The other is *Univerſal*, ſo as to oblige all the Subjects as the Law it ſelf doth, ſo that they muſt underſtand the Law, antecedently to their Obedience. And this is proper to the Law-giver: For the ſenſe of the Law is its Eſſence: And Judges are not the Law-makers. Common Politicks might have taught you this.

§ 5. 4. You ſay [*"The Parliament's proceedings "againſt Chancellor* Hide *and the Earl of* Danby, *"ſhew their ſenſe.*] *Anſ.* 1. It was not the ſame Parliament that proſecuted them both. 2. What did the Parliament to any ſuch purpoſe? Is impeaching a Delinquent, taking Arms againſt the King's Commiſſion, if unlawful? You ſay, [*"They "mean not to unbinge the Right of the Subject, the "Priviledge of Parliaments, to make void all "Oaths, Bonds, Engagements of all the legal au-"thorized Judges, Mayor, Magiſtrates, Conſtables, "Officers of the Kingdom.*] *Anſ.* You are a bold Man if you dare ſay that *all theſe are made void*, unleſs the King's unlawful Commiſſions may be reſiſted by Arms. You are for the Biſhops reſolving your Doubts: I pray you go ask the Biſhops that had a hand in making the Act, (Biſhop *Morley*,

ley, or ſuch other that came not in ſince) whether you have hit of the true meaning of it?

CHAP. XXVIII.

§ 1. YOur 27th Section is of the Non-obligation of the Covenant (or Vow.) And here you tell us firſt how much you can declare, and then you give us juſt twenty Reaſons againſt the making and taking of the Covenant, which you knew were impertinent to any thing that I ſaid: And yet many of them are as impertinent to the end which you ſeem to intend; and a Covenanter would ſoon ſhame. A bad Argument wrongeth the beſt Cauſe.

1. You ſay, *There was never ſuch an Oath taken by any Perſon fearing God. Anſ.* How prove you that? Oh! very eaſily: You bid us prove the Affirmative. Pitiful! So you may affirm that never Man in the World ſaid or did that, which we cannot prove that ſome ſaid or did: or affirm an univerſal Negation, becauſe we prove not the contrary. 2. Might not an *Arrian* at *Nice* (*Conc.* 1.) ſay, Never ſuch a Creed was drawn and impoſed before. 3. May not the Pope ſay to the firſt Proteſtants, Never ſuch a Proteſtation was made before? 4. But I pray you read better the *Scottiſh Hiſtory*, and ſee whether no ſuch Covenant was made in *Scotland* before.

Your 5th is more pitiful, being a Game at Equivocation. 1. Did you think that the word [*Prelacy*] in the *Common*, or the *Impoſers* ſenſe, did

did mean Paſtors that excel in Gifts and Grace. You may next ſay, it meant Kings, or School-Maſters; when yet they adjoined an expoſitory Deſcription. And I have told you, 1. That Doctor *Burges*, Mr. *Gataker*, and many more openly declared that they would not Covenant againſt the Primitive Epiſcopacy, and were ready to enter their Proteſtation; and the Aſſembly to ſatisfie them, added the Deſcription, as meaning only the *Engliſh* concatenated frame. 2. And the Houſe of Lords took it upon Mr. *Coleman*'s making the ſame Expoſition.

2. But the Biſhops will give you little thanks for ſubjecting them to all Paſtors that have better Gifts and Grace: And they will laugh at you for talking, as if this were the Prelacy in queſtion.

In your 6th you tell us, That Biſhops *Name* and *Thing* are Scriptural: And yet *pag.* 6. you ſay [*A Biſhop and a Presbyter in the Senſe and Language of the Scripture, are the ſame.*] The Reader may think that when you *affirm*, and when you *deny*, it is the ſame. And you ask how they would take an *Oath* to *extirpate Presbyters*, and were told, *They mean not to extirpate them as Biſhops, but as Presbyters.*

Anſ. Did you think you ſpake to the Caſe?

1. If they thought a *Presbyter* as ſuch, as bad as a Biſhop as ſuch, no doubt they would have taken that Oath.

2. But do you take a Biſhop here for the *ſame* as a *Presbyter*, or as a *ſpecies* of *Presbyters*, or as a *ſuperiour* to *Presbyters*? Which ever it is, it's nothing to the Caſe in hand: He that ſaith, *We renounce*

renounce Dioceſan Prelacy, but not *Preeminence of Gifts*, nor *Parochial Epiſcopacy*, doth but ſay plainly, I renounce not another thing by renouncing Prelacy in the known and explained Senſe: But he that ſaith, renounce Presbyters but not Biſhops, as they ſignifie the ſame thing, or as *Presbyters* ſigniſieth the whole *Genus*; or yet as Biſhops are the Governours of Presbyters, ſpeaketh groſs Contradictions.

And when after you Argue ſometimes from the worth of the Perſons to the goodneſs of the Office, and ſometime from the old Epiſcopacy, to the Engliſh Dioceſan Prelacy; you do but loſe your words as to us.

And I could wiſh you would have left out your *medium* of multitudes of Proteſtants that would turn Papiſts, if the Papiſts could prove as much for them of Antiquity and Univerſality, as the *Engliſh* Dioceſan Prelacy can: When I conſider how in the ſame Empire they grew up together, I would not have you be the Man that ſhould Diſpute with a Papiſt, who undertaketh to prove the *Roman Primacy* as ancient as our Species of Dioceſan Prelacy deſcribed in the Covenant, and to be acknowledged then by as many. I ſay not that they can prove it: But I had rather you laid not ſo much upon it.

You equivocate when you ſay, All ſides are for Biſhops: You will have few aſſenters when you ſay, "That *Epiſcopacy*, *Presbytery*, and *Independancy*, are not three forms of Church-Government, as three is contrary to Unity (*viz.* of "ſuch Form): And when you ſay, Extirpate one

"and extirpate all (the Forms) becauſe *Godli-*
"*neſs* is the ſame in all. Are not *Monarchy*, *Ari-*
ſtocracy, and *Democracy*, three Forms, contrary to unity of Form; though Humanity, Piety, and Regiment, be the ſame in all? Do they that extirpate *Presbytery*, or *Democracy*, extirpate all? But why ſhould I trouble the Reader, or you, by any further opening of your miſtakes in a Caſe that I am not concerned in, and is none of our Controverſy?

When you ſay that [*The generality of the Non-conformiſts are for a well tempered Prelacy,*] you infer an odious guilt on thoſe Prelatiſts, who write vehemently for our Ruine; as intolerable *becauſe we are againſt Epiſcopacy:* I could name you many ſuch beſides Dr. *Saywel.*

You ſay, "*The Presbyterians and Independants,*
"*were as bitter againſt one another, as the Prelatis*
"*were againſt them both, ſaving Violences, and*
"*Coercive Reſtraints.*

Anſ. I refer it to your ſecond thoughts,

1. Whether this be ſober Conſiſtency.
2. Whether it be true.

1. To be [*as bitter, except Violence, and Coercive Reſtraint,*] is in *Engliſh* to be [*as bitter, except being far more bitter,*] *q. d.* [The differing Proteſtants in *Ireland* were as bitter againſt each other, as the Papiſts againſt both, ſaving Cruelties and Murders.] *Bradford*'s School-maſter, was as hurtful to him as *Bonner*, except Impriſonment and Burning him. He that chides me is as hurtful to me as he that maimeth me, except hurting me more. When you have excepted *Silencing*, *Im-*

Impriſoning, and taking away all our Maintenance, you except much.

2. But yet *is it true?* Remember it was but Presbyterians and Independants that you ſpeak of: Read the Book of their Aſſembly Debates: Read all their Writings againſt each other: I will not except Mr. *Edward's Gangræna*, and ſee whether they do not acknowledg more of God's Grace in one another, and own more of the duty of Loving and Forbearing own another, than the Prelatiſts do by either. Read the Canons that *Excommunicate* them *ipſo facto* as for *wicked Errors*; and read Doctor *Heylin*, *Fowlis*, the Book againſt Mr. *Calamy*'s Farwel Sermon, the *Counterminer*, *L'Eſtrange*, the *Friendly Debate*, Mr. *Parker*; and a multitude more ſuch; and of old Biſhop *Bancroft*; and in a word, the Ordinary Viſitation Articles, or *Peter Studley*, and a multitude ſuch, that Preacht and Wrote againſt them as Hypocrites, Phariſees, Schiſmaticks, and ſuch like, and then conſider how far you have here ſwerved from known truth. I may ſay that I knew all thoſe Times, and the ſorts of Perſons mentioned, much better than you: Many Sectaries were very bitter, and ſome too bitter againſt them. The Presbyterians and Independants contended with too much intemperance and unskilfulneſs. But ſure if they had thought as ill of one another as the Prelates did of both, when they had power, they would as much have Silenced and Ejected one another; which they did not. I remember not ever to have known any meer Presbyterian or Independant, eſpecially

Miniſters, but openly declared that they looked on both parties as the Servants of Chriſt, whom they ſhould love and honour. But this is nothing to our Cauſe.

You ſay truly, [" *An Oath is a ſacred thing,* " *and it is dangerous to uſe Shifts and Stretches.*] And if ſo, it is not without danger to perſuade thouſands ſo to do, or to juſtifie many hundred thouſand if they will be down-right perjured.

You ſay, [" *If one may judge of thoſe Times by* " *theſe now preſent, a great many ſwore Pell-mell* " *they knew not what, becauſe they knew not what* " *Presbytery, Independancy, and Epiſcopacy was.*]

1. No doubt many did ſo.

2. But they partly knew what the Engliſh Prelacy was, by long Experience; and they ſwore not for Presbytery or Independancy, nor againſt all Epiſcopacy.

3. But if you think that *they do ſo in theſe Times*, you and I ſhould lament it: For God will not hold them Guiltleſs, whether they be Paſtors and Churches, or Cities and Corporations, that take his Name by Perjury in vain: It's better call them to Repentance, than juſtifie them in it. To contract the guilt of the Perjury of many thouſands is an expeditious way to Miſery, and doth a great deal in a little time.

§ 2. Having thus proved that which I denied not, you proceed to add Nineteen Propoſitions about the Caſe in queſtion, in all which it is not eaſie to be ſure which ſide you conclude for: You grant moſt of my premiſes, which make againſt Perjury.

Perjury. You confeſs, that "*If any one Perſon be* "*bound by that Oath to endeavour an alteration of* "*Church Government, no Man may with a ſafe* "*Conſcience ſubſcribe this.* And, *If there be evil* "*in the Government of the Church, which may* "*well and conveniently be reformed, you do not ſee* "*but that all that have taken that Oath, ſtand* "*bound in their Places and Calling to endeavour it:* "*There can be no juſt Reformation without ſome* "*Alteration.* A great deal more than this you grant, how Rulers are bound to yield in things confeſt indifferent, which others account Sin, were it but to heal our Breaches: And what a Sin it is to caſt out of the Church multitudes of holy Conſcientious Men for a ſmall and tolerable Error, when all have ſome, *&c.* But yet inſtead of a Concluſion, if you are intelligible, you induce Men to ſubſcribe, though that which they fear, be (not accuſing any) leſt they ſhould be guilty of many hundred thouſand Perjuries.

You ſay, 1. ["*We muſt in expounding Laws* "*regard the meaning of our Governours.*]

Anſ. True: But is it their meaning *de genere*, or *de ſpecie*, or *individuo*? Our Governour's meaning is not to approve *Perjury*. But ſuppoſe yet they had commanded me to ſwear that no man is bound by the Oath of Supremacy; is it no Perjury ſo to ſwear. Then we might ſwear any thing commanded while the Commander ſaith, He is not for Perjury. If Rulers command men to marry their own Siſters, and yet ſay, That they abhor Inceſt, may one juſtifie this becauſe they are *againſt Inceſt*? If

Rebels riſe in Arms againſt their Rulers, but yet renounce Rebellion, how are they to be expounded?

But you ſay, [" *If there be any thing in the* " *Government contrary to the Word of God, The* " *Laws, Canons, Liturgy, Offices of Judges and* " *Miniſters do bind all men againſt it, as null* " *and void, though not aboliſhed by Parliament.*]

Anſ. And what then? Do you infer [Therefore we may ſubſcribe; or therefore we muſt interpret nothing in the Law to be againſt God's Word; or therefore we muſt not ſubſcribe it? The laſt is the true Concluſion. If *Socinians* renounce all that is againſt God's Word, and yet command you to renounce Chriſt's Godhead, may you do it?

2. But I would fain ſee the words which you here ſuppoſe in the Law, Canons and Liturgy; and whether they leave us all to be Judges *what is againſt God's Word?* And,

3. I would have you expound to me, 1. The Canon that requireth us to ſubſcribe, that *There is nothing in the Liturgy againſt God's Word.* 2. And that which excommunicateth all that ſay there is any thing againſt it. 3. And the Law that layeth us in Gaol, and ruineth us, if we ſo ſay and do forbear accordingly. Is it an Argument to ſay, [The Law renounceth all that is contrary to the Word of God; and Excommunicateth, and Silenceth, and ruineth you, if you ſay that there is in the Liturgy any thing againſt it: *Ergo*, You may ſubſcribe though there be ſomewhat againſt it, becauſe the Law diſowneth

eth it?] I would not think you mean this: Therefore I know not what you mean to infer, unleſs it be your next words: [" *Therefore what Faults* " *be in the Government, are rather the Faults of* " *the Governours.*] Alas, this is it and worſe. Thus you might infer, There is no fault in the Papal Government, if the Pope in general renounce all that is againſt God's Word, and then bids you ſwear that Popery is not againſt it. *Turks* and *Heathens* renounce in general all *ſinning againſt God*, and yet I would not ſay that their Laws may be owned as ſinleſs.

You ſay, [" *If all Governours in Church and* " *State faithfully did their Duties according to the* " *Canons, Liturgy, &c. it would be happy for all* " *ſides.*]

Anſ. No Man can tell by theſe words, whether you mean [*If they did all that the Laws and Canons command them,*] or [*If they did the good part and left out the bad.*] If the later be your ſenſe, it is againſt you: If it have a bad part which we muſt not do, it hath a part which we muſt not conſent, covenant, or promiſe to do. If the former, then you have part of your Happineſs, and may ſoon enough ſee more. Your honeſt word's elſewhere ſhew that you take it for no Happineſs, to have all profeſſed Non-conformiſts Excommunicated according to the Canon, and Silenced and Ruined according to the Law.

And yet I cannot tell how to agree you with your ſelf: You ſay, [*All good and peaceable Men would be protected, whether Conformiſts, or Non-conformiſts.*

Anſ. As Mr. *Field*, Mr. *Thompſon*, and others that died in Gaol were; or as Mr. *Hughs*, Mr. *Joſeph Allen*, and others that died by their Priſon-Diſeaſes were; or as thoſe that muſt be Silenced, or lie in *Gaol* ſix Months, and pay forty pound a Sermon; or as Men Excommunicated *ipſo facto* are protected.

§ 3. You ſay, [" *The words of the Declara-*
" *tion do not ſay, No Man is bound to endeavour*
" *the alteration of the Governours but the Govern-*
" *ment, that is, Of the Laws, Rules, and Canons,*
" *by which they govern, and the ſeveral Offices*
" *which be in the Church.— Theſe may be good.—*
" *The office may be Divine, or juſtly prudential, or*
" *tolerably lawful.— Suppoſe the Oath and Cove-*
" *nant doth not bind to endeavour the alteration of*
" *the Chancellor's Office.—* Your Concluſion ſeems implied in your Challenge. [" *Now let any Non-*
" *conformiſt prove that there is any Office in the*
" Engliſh *way of Church Government ſimply un-*
" *lawful*, &c.]

Anſ. 1. Have you anſwered the proof that I pretend to have brought in my *Diſput.* of Church Government? If not, muſt I write it again as oft as you will bid me? Or would it be here meet to write a Treatiſe to anſwer this your Challenge? But get it tolerated, and it ſhall ſoon be done.

2. You ſay, *The Government is the Laws, Rules, and Canons, by which they Govern:* And if theſe need not be altered, why did you before diſown the exerciſe of them, as a great Sin? And yet this

 implieth

implieth [*The Law and Canon, which Excommunicate Non-conformists, and which deny the Lord's Supper to those that kneel not, and which silence Non-subscribers to the* 36th *Canon, and which deny Baptism to those that scruple the* English *use of the Cross and God-fathers, and which ruine all that preach when Silenced, need no alteration, as simply unlawful.*]

But we must prove them unlawful: Come to me then in private, and let us debate the Case, and I will prove to you as much as I affirm. In the mean time, if it will go for any Proof with you, I crave your answer to these Arguments which some use, that doubt of the lawfulness which they dare not deny.

I. A Church-governing Office for the exercise of that power of the Church Keys by Lay-men, which Christ hath appropriated to the Clergy is sinful: But such is the Office of our Lay-Chancellors: *Ergo*, &c.

II. A species of Prelacy which is destructive of, or inconsistent with the form of particular Churches, and of Bishops and Presbyters, and the exercise of that Church-Discipline which Christ and his Spirit in the Apostles did institute is sinful. But (they fear) such is the English Diocesan species of Prelacy: *Ergo*, &c.

III. The Government which is to be the execution of the foresaid Canons, and Act of Uniformity, &c. for Expelling, Excommunicating, Silencing, Imprisoning, Ruining Non-conformists, you said before was unlawful— But— *Ergo*.

But here I would, as your real Friend, advise you

you to two things more; as well as not needlesly to contract the guilt of that which you call *grievous Sin* in others.

1. That you will publish your Retractation of those words ["*The words of the Declaration do* "*not say, No Man is bound to endeavour the alte-* "*ration of the Governours, but only of the Go-* "*vernment.*]

Do you consider what you say?

1. You know that it is the Government of the *State* as well as Church, that is here expressed: And do you think that the King and Parliament never intended to keep Men from deposing the King? Or the Lords, and Commons, and Judges, though they changed not the *Species*, but set up others in their steads? Or will the Bishops so expound it to you, as that it meaneth not that you are not obliged by the Covenant, to pull down all the present Bishops if you set up others in their stead?

2. That you avoid the commoner answer of others, who say, That it is only the *Essentials* of Government that are here meant, and not any Integrals, or Accidents. For,

1. The King and State-Government is here touched. And dare you say that [If any Man think that the Covenant bindeth him to destroy all the King's Civil Government, except the bare essentials of Monarchy, that the Parliament intended not here to contradict him?]

2. And I doubt the Bishops will be angry with you and call you Schismaticks, if you say that the Parliament here meant not to contradict them that

that ſay, they are bound by the Covenant to turn our Dioceſan Biſhops into Parochial ones, or into one in every Corporation, and to take down their Court Officers, and their Lordſhips, Parliament, Power and Wealth. That which ſerveth Men beſt in Arguing, will not beſt pleaſe the Men that they plead for.

You ſay, ["*We grant that there is no one thing* "*in the Epiſcopal Government, but what we may* "*well bear with, and ſubmit to.*]

Anſ. 1. We well may and muſt bear with that which we cannot help. In *Moſcovy* we may fear that all Preaching is put down, ſaving reading Homilies; and a Man may there live Godly: But do not you therefore tell all Men, that if the ſame were done here, we may enter into a ſolemn Covenant, never to endeavour to reform it: No, were it but the high places in *Judæa*.

2. *Submitting* is either by *Obedience*, or *meer Patience*. Under *Papiſts* and *Turks* Men muſt ſubmit by Patience: But if you ſay, *We hold* that we muſt obey all that they command, our practice tells you, It is not true. But the queſtion is, *Whether there be no one thing, but what we may covenant never to endeavour to alter, and ſubſcribe that no Parliament Man, or any other in* England, *is bound by that Oath, which they took, to endeavour it?* The Law forbids me to ſay, *They are*, and therefore I ſay it not: But if you ſay, *They are not*, Dare you undertake to anſwer for them?

You ſay, *Their Office binds them to no evil.* That is, None of the things fore-mentioned are *evil*: Which you ſaid were ſo.

Again

Again you ſay, *All the while Excommunications and Church Cenſures are ſoundly done, it's the the leſs matter by whom they are done.*

Anſ. 1. Do not ſay ſo to the King about Kingly Government: Nor to the Judges if an intruder invade the Tribunal.

2. Make the Biſhops believe this if you can, of any that ſhould uſurp their Office.

3. Make the Pariſh Prieſts believe it if you can, who are ſo angry with us for helping them at a diſtance, though we invade not Places.

4. Make any ſober Miniſters believe if you can, that if the Word be well Preacht, and Sacraments ſoundly Adminiſtred, it is no matter who doth it.

5. Make any *Maſter* of a *Family*, or *Husband*, believe it as to their Offices, that it's no matter who doth it, ſo it be ſoundly done. If the Wife do believe, it's two to one the Husband will not.

§ 4. Again you ſay, [" *By the Government of* " *Church and State, whatſoever is abſolutely ſinful* " *is forbidden,— the Laws declare it Null*, &c.]

Anſ. This is before anſwered. You ſay, *Silencing and Excommunicating the Non-conformiſts here, are ſinful.* Inſtead of this impertinent talk, go try your Oratory on the Judges and Biſhops; if you can perſuade them that the Law forbids them all to fine, Impriſon, or Silence us, or Excommunicate us: Why did you not uſe this pretty Argument for your ſelf?

2. And do not *Papiſts*, and *Turks* ſay, that No Law againſt God is in force? And doth their Govern-

Government therefore contain no evil? Or will you tell them that ſwear to amend it, that it's well enough already?

You tell us what to ſay to the Biſhops and Judges for our ſelves: But if by this Medium, I would prove that I am conformable to the Law, and they are the Non-conformiſts that puniſh me, becauſe they break the Law of God; I doubt they would Laugh at me firſt, and ſend me to Gaol next.

§ 5. But in anſwer to, *Where read we in Scripture of the Chancellor's Office?* You repeat again, [*If ſoundly done, no Man may reprove them.*] I will not repeat my Anſwer: But I add; If ſo, No Man may reprove the Boys if they ſoundly Whip their Maſter when he deſerveth it; nor a Cobler that will ſend Offenders to Priſon as the Lord Mayor doth: Nor a Juſtice, yea, or a Tinker, that will ſtep up in the Chancery, or King's-Bench, to do Juſtice.

§ 6. But though I will not Laugh at your Writing; I ſhould hardly forbear if I heard you do what *page* 95, you ſay you would do, *viz.* [" *If a Biſhop, or Arch-Biſhop, or Chancellor,* " *live where you are Paſtor, and be a Member of* " *your Congregation, you muſt needs look on your* " *ſelf as obliged by the Laws and Canons of the* " *Church and State, by the Word of God, and by* " *the Rules of the Common-prayer-Book, publickly* " *to admoniſh him, if he groſly miſdemean himſelf,* " *and do a ſcandalous crime; and if he ſhall not by*

open

" *open confeſſion give ſatisfaction to the Church,*
" *bar him from the Sacrament, and declare him*
" *Diſorderly and Contumacious, and that if he do*
" *not repent he ſhall periſh; and warn the People to*
" *beware of ſuch evil Courſes, and to have no more*
" *to do with him than they needs muſt: And this I*
" *maintain to be part of the Diſcipline and Govern-*
" *ment of the Church of* England.)

Anſ. I would I could ſee this bout. I doubt he will have ſomething to do with you. Your Chancellor had the wit to begin with you firſt. I pray you forget not this Caſe when you go to the Biſhop for his ſenſe of the Liturgy, and tell us his anſwer when you come Home.

I muſt profeſs this is an edifying Paſſage: As when I read in *Saltmarſh*, that *Chriſt repented* and *believed for us*, it let in more Light againſt Libertiniſm, than I had before: So doth this Paſſage raiſe up ſome uſeful doubts in me about our Churches, which I thought not on till now.

Q. 1. Whether are the Biſhops that dwell in the *London* Pariſhes (or others) Members of the Pariſh Church where they dwell?

Q. 2. If they are not, Whether dwelling in the Pariſh make a Chriſtian a Member of the Pariſh Church?

Q. 3. If not, what is it that makes a Member, and how are the Paſtors ſpecial Flock truly known to him from others?

Q. 4. If they be Members, to whom ſhall we preſent the Biſhop for not coming to Church, or for his Crimes? Is it to himſelf?

Q. 5.

Q. 5. Whether is the Biſhop, or the Pariſh Prieſt there the higher Power, or Governor? and which muſt obey?

Q. 6. Doth the Canon that forbids Men to go from their own Pariſh Churches, extend to the Biſhop?

Q. 7. How is the Biſhop one of the Parſon's Flock, and the Parſon one of the Biſhop's Flock, both at once?

Q. 8. Whether the Biſhop that is Excommunicated by the Parſon out of the Pariſh Church, be caſt out of the Univerſal? or other Churches, may have Communion with him, or not?

Q. 9. What if the Parſon Excommunicate the Biſhop, and the Biſhop the Parſon both at once, what a Caſe are they in? And which ſhall ſtand, one or both, and how far?

Q. 10. How will the Parſon practice his Conformity, who conſenteth when he putteth any one from the Sacrament, to certifie the Ordinary within fourteen Days? will he proſecute the Biſhop to himſelf, or to his Chancellor?

Q. 11. Doth not this Inſtance prove Mr. *Cheyney*, to be a miſtaking Expoſitor of the Church-Government, the Biſhops themſelves being Judges? and would not one days practice of any ſuch thing convince him by Experience, that the Church of *England* now take not Pariſh Parſons for Pariſh Biſhops?

Q. 12. Is he in the right, *page* 96. that this Courſe would make Biſhops, and Arch-Biſhops, and Chancellors, *ſtand in awe of the Prieſts*? why then did you not thus awe your Biſhop and Chancellor?

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIX.

YOur 28th Section hath nothing in it that requireth many words for Anſwer: That Oaths and Laws muſt be charitably expounded no one denieth, ſo they be truly expounded. In this we ſtand to Biſhop *Sanderſon*'s Rules, which are far better ſtated than any thing here ſaid by you.

And your citing my limited and conditional approbation of the Aſſemblies Catechiſms, and the Synod of *Dort*'s, is certainly no Reaſon for my abſolute and unlimited profeſſing to Aſſent and Conſent to all things, in Books which have ſo much more which I diſſent from.

CHAP. XXX.

§ 1. YOur 29th Section containeth your unproved Opinions, and falſe Devices, for ſtretching Subſcriptions, Covenants and Profeſſions. And firſt you tell us of the difficulty of uſing any words that may not ſeem doubtful: But yet if there be not a ſatisfactory intelligibleneſs in words, Humane Converſe is overthrown, and Oaths of Allegiance, and all Contracts are of little uſe unto their ends.

§ 2. You ſay, [" *Though there be in this Volume which we call the Common-prayer-Book, "many Matters, Sentences, and Words bound all "toge-*

" *together, yet do we Aſſent and Conſent to no more*
" *but that which goes under the name of the Service*
" *of the Church, and the Rules and Orders touching*
" *the ſame, and the Rites and Ceremonies thereof.*

Anſ. If you ſay [*All things contained in it*] means not [*all things*] indeed, tell us what difference there is between the Equivocations of the Jeſuits, and this of yours. So one tells me, that [when we profeſs to Aſſent to all in the Bible,] the meaning is [*To all the Precepts, Promiſes, and Words of God in it*, but not that there is no Humane Errors in Numbers and Chronologie, Genealogie, Hiſtory, or Citations.] And ſo you may ſay, [I will ſwear not to endeavour any alteration of the Government of the State, but I mean not to alter Monarchy.] And what may not one thus ſay and ſwear?

2. But yet I think it is no great number of [*Matters, Sentences,* and *Words*] which are neither (*Service, Rules, Orders,* or *Rites.*) Rubricks and Calendars, and ſome Prefaces belong to theſe. But it is a ſtrange Interpretation which would exclude Doctrinals, ſuch as the Article of Faith, of the certain Salvation of all Infants baptized, and dying before actual Sin. Your Citations ſignifie nothing for your purpoſe, but tell us what you would have them ſignifie.

§ 3. But now I come to *Sampſon*'s Hair, the very ſtrength of all your Book, *page* 115. The Preface ſaith, [" When Doubts ariſe in the Uſe " and Practice of the ſame, to appeaſe all ſuch " diverſity (if any ariſe) and for the reſolution " of all Doubts concerning the manner how to

"underſtand, do and execute the things contain-
"ed in this Book, the Parties that ſo doubt, or
"diverſly take any thing, ſhall always reſort to
"the Biſhop of the Dioceſs, who by his diſcretion
"ſhall take order for the quieting and appeaſing of
"the ſame, ſo that the ſame Order be not contra-
"ry to any thing contained in this Book.]
Whence you gather, that the Law makes the Biſhop the common Expoſitor; and if he gives a good Expoſition, or by ſilence ſhew conſent, all is ſafe, and you may Conform.

I confeſs this Reed is the ſtrongeſt ſupport of your Cauſe that I have met with: And I am not cenſuring others that lean upon it: I doubt not but they may be better Men than I: But I will tell you why I cannot.

1. It is a help to thoſe that be in doubt: But I am out of doubt in many of the Reaſons of my Non-conformity; and therefore it is no help to me.

2. The words expreſly limit the Biſhops Expoſition, [*ſo that his order be not contrary to any thing in the Book.*] If it be not contrary to the Book, it will give me no ſatisfaction: If it be contrary, it is of no force.

3. It is only about (the *things contained in the Book*) that the Biſhop muſt reſolve us: Now either the Acts of Uniformity are part of thoſe things, or not: If yea, then it is the Acts alſo that I muſt Aſſent and Conſent to; which you as well as I are far from. And you maintain that the Act is no part of the Book: If not, then the Biſhop hath no power to expound the Act: And

the

the forms of Aſſent and Conſent, and Subſcripti-on impoſed, are parts of the Act.

4. The words make not the Biſhop the publick or common Expoſitor of the Law, or Book, as Judge; but only as a Teacher, who bindeth but ſo far as he tells the truth: The Biſhop muſt teach his ignorant or divided Clergy, how to underſtand what they underſtand not: And this is not about their Subſcriptions, but matters of *Uſe* and *Practice* (as where the Table ſhall ſtand, and ſuch like.) That it maketh not the Biſhop the obliging Judge of the Law, appeareth,

1. Becauſe here is no ſuch word.

2. The foreſaid limitation ſpeaketh the contrary.

3. Elſe there might be as many Religions, Doctrines, or Practices as Biſhops, or many at leaſt: I will give you all the little Money in my Purſe, if you will get me under the hand of Biſhop *Morley*, Biſhop *Gunning*, Biſhop *Sparrow*, and Arch-Biſhop *Stern*, their approbation of your Expoſitions of the parts of Conformity, written in your Book. And I ſuppoſe you know how zealouſly many write (as well as Doctor *Saywel*) againſt tolerating diverſity of Forms and Rites, and Orders of Worſhip. And this would be to ſet up as many Sects, or Ways, as differing Biſhops pleaſed. This Caſe was notably tried between Arch-Biſhop *Laud*, and the Church that followed him, and *Williams*, Biſhop of *Lincoln*, about the Table, or Altar.

4. Elſe Biſhops would have the Legiſlative Power: For the ſenſe of the Law is the Law:

And if the Parliament form but the Letter or Body of it, and the Biſhop may give it what Senſe or Soul he pleaſeth; it is he that will be the chief Law-maker.

5. Elſe Biſhops might corrupt and change our Religion and Church, under pretence of Expoſition. Biſhop *Godfrey Goodman* of *Gloceſter*, who was a *Papiſt*, might have ſet up Popery in his Dioceſs, by putting a Popiſh ſenſe upon Subſcription, Words, and Practices: And the Biſhops by agreement might ſet up Popery in the Land, by the ſame means. Or a Biſhop might ſet up Non-conformiſts, by gratifying them by his Expoſitions. The thing meant in thoſe words is no ſuch dangerous power, but only an Inſtructing and a Pacifying, informing of the Clergy, when they ignorantly differ about ſome dark Word, or Circumſtance, or Practice; the Biſhop muſt teach them the true ſenſe of the Book, but do nothing againſt any thing therein.

6. Is it not called *An Act for Uniformity*, and impoſeth all the heavy Penalties on purpoſe to procure Uniformity? Would they have Silenced and Ruined two thouſand Miniſters for Non-conformity, if Uniformity had not been thought of more worth than their Miniſterial Labours? And can you think that after all this, they meant to leave it to the particular Biſhops, whether there ſhould be any Uniformity or not? You think one Biſhop will ſay, [*You are Pariſh Biſhops, and may publickly admoniſh and reprove the Scandalous, and Excommunicate them* Excommunicatione minore: *You may give them the Sacrament, that conſcienci-*

ouſly

ouſly ſcruple Kneeling; you may Baptize them that conſcienciouſly ſcruple the dedicating Croſs, and the Engliſh ſort of God-Fathers; you may refuſe to ſay the words of Prayer, which imply his Salvation, over the Dead who were Excommunicable, though not Excommunicated: You may underſtand the Article which profeſſeth the certainty of Baptized Infants ſalvation, of thoſe only that are the Children of faithful Parents, or Pro-parents; you may ſay you Aſſent to all in the Book, and mean not all but ſome part, and that not as true, but as uſable: You may profeſs Conſent to uſe it all, and yet not mean to uſe the Calendar, or Rubricks, or to Adminiſter the Sacraments otherwiſe than as aforeſaid: You may Say, or Subſcribe, or Swear, that it is, on any pretence whatſoever, unlawful to take Arms againſt any Commiſſioned by the King, and mean only ſuch as are lawfully Commiſſioned. *You may ſubſcribe that no one in* England *that ſware it, is bound by the ſolemn Vow and Oath, to endeavour any alteration of Government in Church or State, and mean only that he muſt not endeavour it by Sedition or Rebellion.*] And ſo on to the end.

But other Biſhops will ſay the clean contrary: *viz.* That the Biſhop is the only Paſtor, and the Pariſh Prieſt hath none of the power here named, and ſo of all the reſt: And what Uniformity then will there be? Know you not how they write againſt ſuch different Adminiſtrations, as deſtructive and intolerable?

7. And know you not that a Biſhop hath no power againſt the Canons? The Canons are their own Laws and Judgment, and bind them: And

when the Canon saith, *e. g.* He shall be suspended that giveth the Sacrament to one that kneeleth not; or that the Non-conformists are *ipso facto* Excommunicate, *&c.* Hath the Bishop authority to say the contrary?

8. And you know that I wrote not to accuse you, or any Man for Conforming, but to tell them that judge us worthy to be Silenced and Ruined, what our Non-conformity is: And what use then is your own Latitude to me, or such as I, though I went your own way? For I have askt and heard the Opinion of divers Bishops already, and they have said clean contrary to you. I have heard him that first forbad me Preaching in his Dioceſs, say, that [The Liturgy forbiddeth delivering the Sacrament to any that Kneel not.] I can shew it you under his Hand, that the Priest must not be Judge, when to omit the forementioned words at the burial of the Dead; nor tolerated in such Liberty as you presume on. I have been told by a Bishop, That seeing Christ died for all, the Children of any Parents in the World have right to Baptism, and any Man hath as good right to present to it an Infidel's Child, as to take in an exposed Infidel's Child to his House in Charity. I told you, that Bishop *Sanderson*, publickly before the Bishops, *Nemine contradicente*, told me, That I need not question Baptizing any Infidel's Child, if God-Fathers presented him according to the Order of the Church of *England*. Are we not then concluded against Conformity by the Bishop's judgment, by your own Rule? And must not you be a Non-conformist in the Dioceſs

Dioceſs of any ſuch Biſhop as theſe?

9. And by your Rule, a Man muſt be a Conformiſt in one Biſhop's Dioceſs, and a Non-conformiſt in another's; and change his mode of Religion as he Travelleth, or doth change his Dwelling. I imagine that by your Rule, I might partly Conform in the Dioceſs of *London*, or *Lincoln*, *Hereford*, or *Carliſle*; but I ſhould be as Non-conformable as I am, in the Dioceſs of *Winchester*, *Ely*, *York*, *Norwich*, and any other as far as I yet know.

I conclude that your *Catholicon* may purge your ſelf from all Non-conformity, but it is utterly unprofitable to me: *Facile credimus quod volumus*. I have had as much reaſon as you, to be willing to find Conformity lawful, if it be ſo: I have loſt many thouſand Pounds more by Non-conformity, than you have got by Conformity. But I have no ſuch Byas on my Will, as ſhould ſet all my Wit on work to find, or buy a Rope for my Conſcience. And I find nothing better that you offer me herein.

§ 4. When you have told us, [*Where no God-Fathers can be had, we muſt Chriſten without*;] and ſuch like: You ſay, [" *And this is the com-*" *mon ſenſe put upon the Law, by the Law-makers* " *themſelves, that is, by the Biſhops.*]

Anſ. What reaſon did you think we have in ſuch an Hiſtorical Aſſertion, to believe your bare word? In what Synod did they declare it? Why did you neither name the Biſhops, nor the Time, or Place, or Witneſs, by which it might be pro-

ved the common ſenſe? But could you think this ſhould convince me, that know it to be falſe?

§ 5. You tell us, *pag.* 119. [" *If it were a* " *part of Aſſent and Conſent, that Ordination* " *by good and ſubſtantial Presbyters were null, it* " *would be a hard point indeed,— to Unchurch* " *Churches, and Unbaptize the Baptized, and plead* " *the cauſe of Satan, the Pope, and all Malignants* " *of the Miniſtry, in the Name of Chriſt.*

Anſ. Excuſe us then for not Conforming. I before gave you this Proof, that it is the ſenſe of the Law-makers, or Biſhops: *They that abhor Reordination (or twice ordaining to the Prieſthood) and yet require thoſe to be ordained by Biſhops, who were before ordained by Presbyters, muſt be judged to hold the ſaid Ordination by Presbyters to be null.*— But, *&c. Ergo.*

§ 6. 1. You ſay, " *No Man that I know of,* " *takes the Silenced Miniſters, and thoſe ordained* " *by Presbyters only, for no Miniſters at all, unleſs* " *one Mr.* Dodwel, *a high-flown Man, whom Con-* " *formiſts themſelves do utterly diſſent from in* " *this.*

Anſ. Your ignorance is no good reaſon for my Conformity: If you know of no more, I do. Read Mr. *Thorndike*, of *Forbearance of Penalties*: Ask Biſhop *Gunning* his judgment, *&c.* If your acquaintance be ſo ſmall, you ſhould not write of that which you know not.

§ 7. 2. But you ſay, *All, both Rulers and* " *People,*

" *People, Conformiſts themſelves do own them for* " *Miniſters; otherwiſe they would take ſome courſe* " *for the Rebaptizing of all Baptized by them.*

Anſ. Did you ever read the Conference at *Hampton Court?* Did you dream that all theſe take Laymens Baptizing for null? Or do you conclude that all think what you think?

§ 8. 3. You prove it from the toleration of the Foreigners Churches in *London.*

Anſ. How will you prove that they judge all true Miniſters whom they Tolerate?

§ 9. 4. You ſay, the " *Acts againſt Conven-* " *ticles, and the Five Mile Act prove it.*

5. " *The King's Proclamation for Indulgence* " *proveth it.*

6. " *The Fines and Impriſonments for Conventi-* " *cles prove it.*

7. " *The allowing four Perſons to meet in pri-* " *vate proveth it.*

8. " *The common ſenſe of Biſhops, Divines, and* " *People of the Church of* England, *prove it.*

Anſ. You may next ſay, That any thing that you ſee or hear proveth it. It's liker theſe prove the contrary, than this. By this Men may ſee how little ſatisfaction we may expect from your arguing. You greatly wrong the King, Parliament, and Biſhops, if you think they take all for Miniſters, Men, Women, or Children, whoſe meeting they tolerate: You leave out the Argument from the Act of Uniformity, which puniſheth all by a hundred Pound a time that Adminiſter

the

the Sacrament, being not ordained by a Biſhop. Doth that prove them Miniſters too?

§ 10. You ſay, [" *As to the Peoples Conformity, I know no one thing required of them to* " *Conform to, but what they may do with a good* " *Conſcience.*

Anſ. Why then did you paſs by the anſwering of my Book concerning their part? Particularly about the Corporation-Declaration? Should they be in the right that think all the Cities and Corporations in *England* to be under that—— which I am loth to name; and that Plagues, Flames, and Poverty, are God's Revenge; Oh! what a thing would it be for a Servant of Chriſt, to ſay to them in Print, [O *England* repent not!]

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXI.

§ 1. YOur Concluſion is alſo a bundle of Miſtakes, and Impertinencies.

1. It is more than three or four points that the new Conformity addeth to the old.

2. If the number or goodneſs of the old Conformiſts did prove their Cauſe good, many things would have a far ſtronger Proof of that kind, from the ancient Churches, which yet you judge to be unlawful; and in other Countries the ſame Argument will be turned againſt you.

3. Such Men as you call [*The main Body of the beſt Divines,*] were very few in compariſon of the Ignorant bad Clergy.

4. It is not true that Mr. *Knewſtubs* was a Conformiſt, nor Dr. *Reynolds* neither, unleſs I be one. The Petition of the Non-conformiſts to King *James*, was called *Millenary*; becauſe it had a thouſand Hands in a little compaſs.

5. That ſome then did, and now do ſcruple more than others, is impertinent to our Buſineſs, and it were a wonder if it were not ſo, till Men are arrived at ſcrupling nothing.

6. The 36th *Canon* was the chief point of the old Non-conformity, and will receive no juſtification by the worth of any Subſcribers. I doubt not but *Bernard*, *Gerſon*, &c. were holy Men, that ſubſcribed far worſe.

7. Sponſors of an ill ſort are never the better, becauſe

becauſe there was a better ſort of old; nor becauſe theſe were before the new Liturgy.

8. *Page* 125. You could wiſh Miniſters would make the Parents to be preſent chief Undertakers, that is, to be Non-conformiſts called Conformiſts. The reſt needeth but the repetition of what is ſaid before, which would rather tire than edifie the Reader.

CHAP. XXXII.

SInce the writing of my Anſwer to your Book, you were with me, and when I gave you two or three Objections which I publiſhed not, you gave me no Reply to them, but went from me and Printed an Anſwer to them in a Supplement. Seeing your judgment is moſt for that way, I crave your patience while I uſe the way you chooſe. I confeſs my judgment is, that you have unavoidably made me a great Temptation to you: For if you be not a Man of great Humility, you will

1. Be offended to find all your Labour proved to be hurtful, and your Reaſoning vain; and you will think that the diſgracing of them by a juſt Confutation, falleth on your ſelf.

2. And you will be tempted to turn your thoughts too partially, to juſtifie what once you have ſo publickly ſaid, and ſo to run further into the Extream. But my perſuaſion of your great ſincerity, maketh me hope that you will overcome

come the temptation which you have choſen.

I. I thought that the word [*Uſe of all*] did much aggravate, and not extenuate the burden of the Declaration, as added to Aſſent. But to them that thought otherwiſe, I thought that when both Lords and Commons at a Conference upon Reaſons given, had rejected that Expoſition which confineth the ſenſe of the words to [*Uſe*,] it had been a more ſatisfactory notice of the Law-givers ſenſe, than either your private Conceit, or any Biſhops Expoſition could be. But you tell us, *That this Conference was no Law, or repeal of the Law.*

Anſ. Impertinent! It is an Expoſition of the meaning of the Law-makers only, that we are enquiring of, and not the repealing or making of a Law. It is the Law-makers part to be the publick obliging Interpreters of the Law to the whole Kingdom. We are enquiring in point of Conſcience, how we muſt underſtand them: And you will not believe them it ſeems, unleſs they make a new Law, to tell you the ſenſe of the old one.

II. Every one may know, that it's uſual for the *Means* to have ſomewhat in it for the *End*, beſides the intending of the End it ſelf; and that uſually Laws and Canons command many Means for one End. And therefore to make your full and conſtant *uſage* of Conformity to be the End, and the Aſſenting and Conſenting to all things in the Book to be the Means, even

in

in that form of words, are no contradiction. And it's uſual to be *ſtricter* in preſcribing *forms of Words*, for Oaths, Covenants, or Confeſſions, than in the other integral parts of a Law. And it is a great wrong to a Parliament of *England* to ſay either that, in ſuch a form impoſed on the Learned and Conſciencious Tribe, they knew not how to ſpeak intelligibly according to the common uſe of words, or that they were ſo miſchievouſly Malignant, as ſeventeen or eighteen Years to refuſe to open their ſenſe, for the healing of ſo diſtracted and endangered a Church and Nation, if they meant not as their words do ſignifie according to common uſe. It's no vanity to ſay, I have known the Men, Biſhops and Commons, better than you have done, and heard more of them and their Debates, than you have done; and I am ſatisfied in my Conſcience to conclude, that they meant plainly as they ſpeak, and no better: Even that no Man's promiſe to uſe the Liturgy ſhall be taken for truſty and ſatisfactory, that will not declare that he Aſſenteth and Conſenteth to all things contained in it, and preſcribed by it:] And this plainly *Ex animo*, without uncouth Expoſitions, Equivocations, or Jeſuitical mental Reſervations.

§ 2. I have not wit enough to find out *ſenſe* in your Quibble, that ["*If the later words* (the "Form) *do import more than the former* (for "the Uſe) *then there is ſomething added and al-* "*tered, which poſſibly may inconſiſt and be contra-* "*diction.*]

Anſ.

Anſ. Is not all preſcript of *Means* an addition to the Precept *De fine?* Doth the preſcript of the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance, impoſe no more than to be Loyal? Yes: It requireth a particular teſt of Loyalty. Doth the Command of ſubſcribing the thirty nine Articles contain no more, but to be Orthodox? Yes: It enjoineth us by this *means* to profeſs thoſe particulars, in which our Orthodoxneſs conſiſteth.

§ 3. *Aſſent* when thus diſtinguiſhed purpoſely from *Conſent*, ſignifieth Aſſenting to ſome Truth, and *Conſent* reſpecteth the Good. So that when you make *Aſſent* to be but the ſame as [*Conſent to Uſe*] you feign them to ſpeak Nonſenſe, or to Tautologize. You ſay, [*You Aſſent to all,*] but not that *All is true*: Which is a Contradiction, or Equivocation.

§ 4. [" *Prove* (ſay you) *that there is any* " *one thing in the Book, which may not in the* " *courſe of Conformity be godly uſed?*]

Anſ. To ſome Men I will undertake to prove nothing. If there be no proof in the Book which you write againſt, when you have got leave to Print it, you are likely to have more. Till then, to call for proof when you have it, and ſpeak not ſenſe againſt it, is too eaſie a way to ſatisfie the Juſt.

§ 5. III. I told you by word of Mouth, that your *Catholicon* of truſting, *to the Biſhops Expo-*

Expoſition of the Book (yea, to his *ſilence*, ſo gentle and tractable are you become) is no relief to you for expounding the *Aſſent, Conſent, Subſcription* againſt the *obligation of the Vow*, and *about Arms*, &c. becauſe theſe are part of the Act of Uniformity; and you ſay, that Act is no part of the Book. To this you Print your Anſwer, that you ["*Have another ſtring to your* "*Bow.*] viz. *That the Biſhop is by Law the Or-* "*dinary, to Ordain and take Subſcriptions, and* "*may admit Miniſters to ſubſcribe theſe Teſts with* "*ſuch Explications, Meanings, and Allowances,* "*as will well ſtand with the words juſtly and* "*fairly conſtrued.*

Anſ. 1. The Biſhop is not made the Expounder of the Law, but the Receiver of your Subſcription according to the Law.

2. If you will confound *Indulgent Connivance*, and *Conformity*, muſt we do ſo too? This is Mr. *Humphrey*'s project, And I freely confeſs to you, That if you can meet with an Indulgent Biſhop, it's a fairer way to intromit a Diſſenter, than any that you have named in your Book. All words are ambiguous: The *ſenſe* is the Soul of them. If, *e. g.* I were commanded to ſay that [*The Scripture is not God's Word,*] and I had leave to expound it;

1. [All Scripture, or Writing, is not God's Word, but the ſacred Bible is:] Or [*It is not God's Eternal Coeſſential Word, which is Chriſt*;] were it not for Scandal, this might be ſaid as true. And ſome think the Scandal is ſufficiently avoided, if you give in your ſenſe in Writing, and make

it

it as publick as is your Subſcription. But I think that the very ſubſcribing ſuch ſcandalous Words, will ſcandalouſly harden others, and encourage Tyrannical Impoſers more, than your Expoſition can Cure; and therefore I would not uſe them.

And if I would, I could caſt in ſuch an Expoſitory Writing, whether the Biſhop will or not.

And if he accept it, I pray better underſtand that, *This is not Conformity, but Indulgence, Connivance, Toleration, or Prevarication:* You might as well ſay, He Conformed, that by the King's Indulgence, was excuſed from Subſcribing and Declaring.

You put a Suppoſition, that you had gone to Biſhop *Sanderſon*, and askt *his ſenſe according to his Rules*, de Juramento.

Anſ. I doubt your Party will think you betray their Cauſe by Prevarication.

1. I told you how publickly in a meeting of Biſhops, Biſhop *Sanderſon* gave his judgment about Baptiſm againſt you.

2. I cited the words of his Rules *de Juramento*, in the Book which you anſwer, as being plainly againſt Conformity: And you give no anſwer to it, and yet ſuppoſe them to be for you. This is too ſupine neglect to ſatisfie us.

§ 5. You come over your foreſaid ſenſe of the Declaration again, and *pag.* 160. "*You have better* "*bethought you, and will take the Debate of the* "*Lords and Commons as uſeful to know the mean-*"*ing of the Law.*

Anſ. What ſhall we do then by your *Uſeful* Error? Why you now ſay, [*You know nothing in the Book but what may be aſſented to as true.*]

Anſ. And why was this ſo much diſclaimed before? When you put us to the trouble of Confuting you, you Confute your ſelf by changing your Cauſe, and ſo we labour in vain.

Your Repetitions of the ſame things, with ſaying and unſaying, and bare ſaying without proof are ſo many, that I will not wrong the Reader with Confuting any more of them, ſave only to give you ſome account why I am ſorry: 1. That you retract your ſaying that *Oaths* are *ſtricti juris*, 2. And that while you pretend to own Biſhop *Sanderſon*'s Rules *de Juramento*, you renounce this which is one of the chief of them. And I will tell you the reaſons of my diſſent from that, and moſt of your Book.

IV. By *ſtricti juris*, is not meant the meer Literal Senſe as different from the leſs Proper, which is more notified; but *ſtrict* is contradiſtinguiſhed from *looſe* and *ſtretcht*. I told you the Rule that we go by in this, and it pleaſed you not to Confute it. Thus much I repeat:

1. "We muſt take Oaths, Covenants, and "Profeſſions impoſed by Authority, in the ſenſe "of the Impoſers as near as we can know it.

2. "But if they diſcover their Senſe in words "ſo unmeet, as that in the Vulgar Senſe they ſeem "falſe or wicked, we muſt number ſuch with *un-* "*lawful words*, unleſs we can by the publick no- "tifying the *Expoſition* avoid the Scandal.

3. "We are to take the Laws, and *im-* "poſed words of Rules, eſpecially in Oaths, Co- "venants, and Profeſſions, in that ſenſe as thoſe "words are commonly uſed and underſtood in "that *time* and *place*, by Men of that Profeſſion:

"Un-

"Unleſs the ſaid Rulers make known, that they "uſe them in a different unuſual ſenſe.

4. "We muſt not preſume that they mean not "as they ſpeak, by an unuſual ſenſe, upon dark "and uncertain Conjectures, eſpecially dictated "by our Intereſt, but only by Cogent Evidence. Theſe are our Rules.

The reaſons why we cannot Swear, or Covenant, or profeſs in your *Laxe* and *ſtretched ſenſe*, nor call that ſenſe *honeſt*, as you do, (eſpecially on pretence of a Biſhop's Expoſition, contrary to what I have reaſon to be fully ſatisfied our Law-makers meant) are thoſe which I gave you in the thirty Aggravations, *Sect.* 16. which it did not pleaſe you to contradict. Theſe few I repeat:

I. The words of the Third Command are dreadful, God will not hold him guiltleſs that taketh his Name in vain, or falſly.

II. Such licentious ſtretching of Oaths and Profeſſions overthrow that mutual truſt which is neceſſary to Humane Converſe.

III. It depriveth the King of his due ſecurity of his Subjects Loyalty, and of his Peace and Life. I much fear *leſt relaxing and ſtretching the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy but as much as you relax and ſtretch the words of the Subſcription, Declaration, Liturgie, &c. may untie the Conſciences of Rebels and King-killers ſo far, as to make way for, and conſiſt with Rebellion, and killing the King.*

IV. It ſeemeth to me moſt dangerouſly to expoſe the Lives of all the *Subjects* of the *Kingdom*, to the will of their Enemies, and to be a Vertual Murdering of many, or any (if not all) Per-

ſons that have Enemies: For while two falſe Swearers may take away a Mans Life, if Men are taught to ſtretch Oaths and Equivocate, it will embolden the Conſciences of Men ſo far, as that few Mens Lives ſhall have any ſecurity, but be at the mercy of any Rogues. It is a wonder of God's Merciful Providence, that falſe Swearers murder no more than they do: But ſuch a *Laxity* would make our Caſe far more dangerous.

V. I that greatly fear leſt God's *late dreadful Corporation Judgments, Plague, Flames, Poverty, and Diviſions*, are inflicted for *Corporation Sins*, and among thoſe Sins, eminently for *Perjury*, am more inclined to call them in *Bradford*'s words at the Stake, *Repent, O England*, than to encourage them in ſuch Sin, and by Printing, to perſuade them *not to repent*.

V I. When we cry out of the Jeſuits for ſtretching Oaths and Teſtimonies, and all words by Equivocations, and Mental Reſervations, to the endangering of Kings and Kingdoms, and Mens Lives and Souls, it ill beſeemeth us to imitate or encourage them, or to enable them to ſay, that they ſtretch words no more than we.

V I I. It would be an unexcuſable Sin in ſuch a one as I, who live not in another Age, Land, or Place, where the Impoſers ſenſe could not be known, but in the ſame Age, and Place, and have had ſo many Perſonal Treaties with the Biſhops and the Lord Chancellor *Hide*, who were the chief promoters of the Impoſitions, and who know ſo many of the Parliament and Convocation that made theſe Forms, and have had ſo great and ſatisfactory teſtimony of their Minds and Mean-

Meanings, and their Speeches and Reaſons in Parliament upon theſe ſubjects; and am fully ſatisfied in my Conſcience, that you ſatisfie their meaning. It is not the ſenſe of any Biſhops that came in ſince that Act was made, nor of any odd Perſon that is to paſs for the Law-makers ſenſe.

VIII. People commonly think that Preachers ſhould be ſo much more holy than they, that if they come but near us they are ſafe. And therefore if we ſtretch Oaths and Covenants, they may do that, and ſuch as they count leſſer Sins than Perjury; and ſo we may harden them to Damnation.

IX. It is a heinous aggravation of Sin to do it as for God, and that we may ſerve him in the Miniſtry.

X. It is a dreadful thing to undertake to juſtifie thouſands whom we never knew, as well as the old Parliament Men whom we know, and to prove that they ought not to Repent, nor to endeavour Church Reformation, if it ſhould prove that by a Vow they are bound to ſuch endeavour by lawful means.

XI. I dare not provoke God to deſert me in my Miniſtry, (yea, and in my ſecret Comforts) nor tempt Men to think baſely of the Miniſters as a Perjured ſort of Men, who cry down other Mens Sins, while they have greater of their own.

XII. It is a dreadful aggravation to do all this (not by ſudden Surprize, but) upon Deliberation, and to make a Covenant againſt Duty and for Sin, and to ſay I ought to do it, and never to Repent; yea, and by juſtifying it to harden multitudes againſt Repentance: Eſpecially if it tend to

corrupt the publick ſtate of the Church, and Worſhip.

For theſe Reaſons I cannot uſe Violence with impoſed Oaths, Covenants, or Profeſſions; but muſt expound them in the common ſenſe of Men of that Profeſſion, till the Law-makers themſelves ſhall declare that they mean otherwiſe.

And all this I ſpeak but as the Reaſons of our own Practice, and not at all to accuſe any Conformiſts: Yea, I ſo far excuſe them againſt the *Non-conforming Conformiſt*, that I do take the chief Men of them whom I have known, to mean plainly as they ſpeak: I ſuppoſe they really Aſſent and Conſent to all things contained and preſcribed in the Books; and really mean contrary to your ſtretching Expoſitions of Infants Salvation, of Baptiſm, Communion, Burial, and the reſt. And by Dr. *William Smith*'s Books, and ſuch others, I believe they take ſuch Conforming Non-conformiſts to be (as the late *Weſtminſter* Aſſembly proved) the moſt dangerous underminers of their Church.

And when we have Confuted ſuch as you, our Work is all to begin again, with the ſerious Conformiſts, who deal plainly and go on other Principles.

The

The Second Part.

Mr. Cheney's *Five Undertakings Conſidered.*

§ 1. DEar Brother, you and I have expoſed our ſelves as Publick Warnings to Mankind, to take heed of an overvaluing of their own Underſtandings, and of a haſty confidence in their Erroneous Conceptions, and of raſh obtruding that upon the World as neceſſary Truth, for want of Judgment and Time to digeſt things, which will prove very dangerous Error; and if received and practiſed, alas, what Miſchief may it do! Erring Men know not that they Err: If I think it is you, and you think it is I, and a third think it is both, the Reader greatly profiteth by us, who learneth by our Harms, to have a due ſuſpicion of his own Underſtanding; and ſo it be without unneceſſary Scepticiſm, to have humble thoughts of his Conceptions, which have not had time and helps convenient to ripen them: Eſpecially if your Friend or you be Conſcious, that you have formerly or lately been as confident in that which you now ſee was your Error, you ſhould think that the ſame

Mind is ſtill in danger of Deceit, and it's as eaſie to reel into the other Extreme.

§ 2. Oh what cauſe have we to pray, *Lead us not into temptation!* we little know what is in our Hearts or others, till juſt Trial call it up: Nor what great hurt even good Men may live to do. And if one Error get in, to how many worſe it may open the Door. And if we begin to roul down the Hill, how little know we where to ſtop? But though Satan deſire to have us that he may ſift us, I hope Chriſt's Interceſſion will keep our Faith from failing. But wo, and alas, that we muſt, one or both (which ever is in the wrong) be inſtruments of Miſchief againſt the Intereſt of our dear Lord, and his Truth and Church, and Mens Souls, whilſt both our deſires are to live in the World for no other end, but to build up that, which by Ignorance, Self-conceitedneſs, Error, and Raſhneſs, we are laborioufly pulling down.

§ 3. And if it be I that have by Error wronged the Church, my Caſe is made worſe by your ſtrengthening my Temptation, when inſtead of convincing Argument, you give me little but naked Aſſertions; and ſaying [*I conceive*,] and run into ſuch Singularities as all ſober Men are bound to ſuſpect, and ſome condemn almoſt all Chriſt's Churches, without one word of Convincing Proof.

§ 4. That you Anſwer only in Print to the World, the private Talk that I had with you, whilſt you gave me no Vocal Anſwer, I take but for a ſmall and modal Irregularity: Some Men have Humours and Ways of their own, which they will follow. Had you done it as judiciouſly,

and

and truly, with fear of Erring and Seducing, as you did it publickly, the reſt might be well interpreted: But we muſt take it as it is.

QUESTION. I.

"*Whether it be certain by God's Word, that* "*Infants Baptized dying before Actual* "*Sin, be undoubtedly ſaved?*

§ 1. I expected your Work had been to Convince Men of the good of Conformity: But ſeeing it is to ſave Men from being ſeduced by my Directory, you may doubt whether you will not rather tempt ſome impartial Men to read the words: And then your work is ſpoiled, when they compare them with your Accuſation.

§ 2. I lookt for ſome plain Text of Scripture, to prove this both *certain by God's Word, and undoubted*: But finding none ſuch, I humbly beſeech you hereafter, when you have mind to ſhew your Argumentative ſtrength, leave out the abuſive pretence of the *Word of God*: Holy things muſt be holily uſed.

§ 3. Your firſt Argument is, that [*A Carnal Chriſtian hath propriety in his Child, and therefore may devote him to God, as he may his Goods.*]

Anſ. It had been more piouſly prudent to hear what could be ſaid to ſuch pretty new Knacks, before you had tempted the Church by publiſhing them.

1. Your firſt Proof is, 1 *Sam.* 26. 26, 27, 28. and there are but 25 Verſes in the Chapter, and none to your purpoſe.

The

The next is, *Lev.* 27. 28. Did you ever conſider the Text? *Ainſworth*, and the Rabbies, ſuppoſe from the Notation of the word, and from the expreſs words, *ver.* 29. that it is devoting of Slaves, or Malefactors to death, that is here ſpoken of: Others better, That it includeth both the abſolute dedication of acceptable Perſons to Service, and of odious Perſons to Death: Therefore all are not ſaved that are here called holy as devoted: Neither the *Curſed*, nor the *Levites*, that by dedication obliged to Service, are hereby ſaved: For more than Obligation is neceſſary to the reward. The Firſt-born were ſpecially to be given to God, and yet that implied not their certain Salvation.

2. A Diſſembler may by his Covenant obtain a right with Man, that knoweth not his Heart; and he may be received into the outward Communion of the Church by God's Approbation, who Commiſſioneth Miniſters who know not mens Hearts, to receive Men according to their Profeſſion: And theſe are *holy to the Lord*, as the *Jews* were; but not therefore under a promiſe that they ſhall be undoubtedly ſaved. Were all the *Jews* ſaved becauſe they were a *holy Nation*?

3. Not only his Child, but the groſſeſt hypocritical Lyar himſelf, who is Baptized, and cometh into the Church in Malice to betray it, is yet holy as a Viſible Member; and hath obliged himſelf to real Holineſs, and yet is far from a ſtate of Salvation.

4. Nothing is holy and accepted by the Devoters Act alone, without God's accepting Act: Nor *any further*, or to any other uſes than God accepteth

cepteth it to. Some he accepteth unto Visible Membership and Communion, and some to the Sacred Ministry, and some to Magistracy, &c. who are not accepted to Salvation.

5. Doth *Lev.* 27. prove, that all Nations in the World might devote their Children unto God, with the same assurance of acceptation as the *Israelites*?

6. The Jewish Mosaical Law is abrogated, and neither bindeth us as such, nor secureth us of acceptance for obeying it.

7. All Heathens and Infidels have some propriety in their Children; and yet if in unbelief they devote them with the Tongue alone to God, that will not make their Salvation undoubted.

8. Few God-Fathers have propriety in them: How then will their devoting prove their Salvation?

9. God hath made no promise of his acceptance, which you can shew; therefore you cannot by his Word be certain of it.

10. God saith, that the *Sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to Him*; much more when he doth it with an evil mind: And he expresly saith, [*Else were your Children unclean* (if one Parent were not a Believer) *but now are they holy.*] Therefore when both Parents are Unbelievers, the Children are not accepted of God as holy.

11. The question is, *of all Baptized Children*: For it is *Quatenus Baptizati*, that they are said to be saved; and *à quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*: And it's an Indefinite *in re necessariâ*: But we have too many scorners at Christianity, followers of *Hobbes*, *Spinosa*, *Pomponatius*, and *Vaninus*, who for

for fashion sake, will bring their Children to Baptism: And certainly such are far worse than Heathens. If one believeth not in Christ, tell a wilful Lye, and say he believeth, can any Man think that his Child shall be ever the more saved for his Wickedness and Hypocrisie?

§ 4. You gather Christ's acceptance from *Mat.* 10. 13. *&c. It is not said of the Infants of the Godly only, is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Ans. Nor is it said that *of all Infants*, or of *all Babtized Infants*, is the *Kingdom of Heaven.* The Text will prove indeed, that the *Infant state is capable of Christ's acceptauce into the Kingdom of Grace, and of Glory.* But not that nothing is necessary thereto, but that *they be Infants.*

If *all* Infants be saved, bringing them to Christ was not necessary to their Salvation. If all only that were brought to Christ were saved, it seems they were very few.

2. Is it like that any would bring their Children to Christ to be Blessed, who did not believe in him? And what reason have we to surmise that they were not found Believers?

3. As Christ healed some blind Men, and not all, and some Lepers, Sick, *&c.* so if as a *Specimen*, to shew that Infant state is capable of Grace, he took up some Infants of Hypocrites, or Infidels, or impious Parents, (which can never be proved) it will not follow that all such shall be received, and that to Salvation.

4. If by verbal profession Parents and their Children are taken into the outward Covenant and Church, and by Water Men are born into the Visible Kingdom of God, it followeth not they need

need not to be born of the Spirit for admiſſion into the *Inviſible* and *Heavenly Kingdom*; or that the Spirit always goeth with the Water; and that the Parents *anſwer of a good Conſcience to God*, is not neceſſary to his Child's Covenant-right to Salvation as well as to his own.

5. I deny that *any wicked Man* (much more *every one*) *doth*, yea, or *can*, univocally and truly, devote his Child to God according to the ſenſe of the Baptiſmal Covenant. Though I grant that the love of his Childs Luſt do not hold him ſo ſtrongly as the love of his own; yet he that never ſo knew God in Chriſt, and ſo believed in Chriſt, and ſo believed in him as to perceive him practically to be better for himſelf than all the World and ſinful Pleaſures, cannot with a true and practical Affiance, ſo take him for his Child.

6. And God no where commandeth, or accepteth the devoting of our Infants to him primarily, or as ſeperated from our ſelves; but only as *Appendices*, or Conjunct with us; that is, that we *devote our ſelves and ours*: And ſo not without us, but with us doth he accept them.

§ 5. Your great pretended Proof is, That all the Males of *Iſrael were Circumciſed*.

Anſ. 1. If you had proved that they were all *ſaved*, you had ſaid more to the matter.

2. To open here the nature of the *Jews* Covenant of Peculiarity, as one ſelect Nation of whom Chriſt ſhould come, as diſtinct from, and as conjunct with the common antecedent Covenant of Grace, and to ſhew the reaſons of the Inſtitution of Circumciſion to *Abraham's* peculiar Seed, and

not

not for all that from *Adam* and *Noah*, were under the common Law of Grace, would be a work which such a light occasion would not warrant me here to stand upon.

3. The sign of Circumcision, was but the seal anexed to the Covenant: And the meer External Act (as Water in Baptism) entered them but into the External Church-state.

4. Almost all the gross Sinners at least, if presumptuous and impenitent, were to be put to death by that Law; And dead Men beget not Children. But I have so largely handled this in my 3d *Disp.* of Right to Sacraments, that while you leave it unanswered, I will not repeat it on so slight a Cause.

§ 6. And what if you had proved the Salvation of all wicked Christians Baptized Infants? what's that to our Question, which extendeth to *all*, not excepting the Children of profest Atheists, Infidels, Sadducees, or Heathens, that have but God-Fathers?

§ 7. But *pag.* 8, 9. you tell us, that [" *Infants by reason of their innocent harmless state,* " *seem to be Christ's Off-spring, and to be a subordi-* " *nate Root and Bottom to themselves, and to stand* " *by their own innocency under Christ, and by his* " *Divine Grace.*—— *Look what Regeneration is to* " *the Adult, that in some sort the Infant-state may* " *be to Infants; that is, All Infants are in a New* " *and Second state by Christ: So the word Regene-* " *ration doth properly import.*—— Pag. 10. *Christ* " *alone without Parents Godliness, is able to the* " *Salvation of all the Infant World.*—— *I am not* " *able to prove that bare having of Circumcision and* " *Baptism*

" *Baptiſm doth ſave any; nor that the bare want* " *thereof doth bar any from Salvation.*

Anſ. 1. But what is this to Conformity? Did you think that this was the meaning of the Liturgy, that *all Infants* are ſaved, when it ſaith *All the Baptized?*

2. It doth not follow that Chriſt *ſaveth all, becauſe he is able* to ſave them.

3. I have ſaid ſo much to prove Original Sin, and ſome participation of Guilt from our Parents Sins, and to prove God's Promiſes to the Faithful and their Seed, which are not made to the Infidels and Wicked, in two Diſputations of Original Sin; that I refer you thither for your Anſwer to this unproved Fiction, of the Salvation of all Infants, and their Regenerate Innocency.

4. Woful experience tells us, as ſoon as they can but ſpeak and go, how far their Natures are from an innocent diſpoſition: And to be void of holy Diſpoſitions is not to be innocent.

5. If they be conceived and born Innocent, what need have they of Baptiſm for Remiſſion of Sin? If you ſay that Chriſt Regenerateth all as he is the Giver of their Nature, the Church hath condemned this in the *Pelagians*, that make Nature, as from Chriſt, to be the ſame with Grace.

6. If all be Pardoned, all have the Holy Ghoſt (for Baptiſm giveth right to both.) But that's not ſo.

§ 8. *Page* 11. Did you ſatisfie your Conſcience in expounding, [*But now are they holy*, 1 Cor. 14.] after what we have ſaid of it to Mr. *Tombes?* Is it [*Your Children are pure to you, as your Meat is?*]

§ 9. When

§ 9. When you ask me [*Why I ſay notoriouſly ungodly.*] You conſulted not the credit of your knowledg, to tell Men in Print, that you know not what *Notorious* ſignifieth; no not in Notation, or common uſe: As if it ſignified [*more than ordinary.*] Notorious, is that which is certainly, openly, eaſily, *Knowable.* I have told you of ſome of my own Pariſhioners, that live in the open oppoſition to Chriſtianity, ſeeking in their Converſe to perſuade Men, that the Scripture is a Book of Lyes, and Chriſtianity a meer Deceit, and they will bring their Children to Baptiſm for *Law* and *Cuſtom*-ſake; and ſay all the Creed, and words required (it was in the time when I had leave to admit the Parent to enter his own Child in the Covenant with God.) We know now abundance of the followers of *Hobbes*, and *Spinoſa*, and many that deride Scripture, and the hopes of Heaven, and the fears of a Hell, and think Man is but a ſubtle ſort of Beaſt: Yet theſe will all have their Children Baptized, and to avoid the penalty of the Law, will receive the Euchariſt. And there are others who are common ſcorners of Serious Religiouſneſs, and perſecutors of it to their power; and hate him that will tell them of the evil of the common Drunkenneſs and Whoredom which they live in, and glory in their Shame. We look for better proof than your Wrigling-nothings, to make us undoubtedly certain from God's Word, that the Baptized Infants of all theſe are ſaved: The Rubrick meaneth, [*Quia & qua, Baptized*;] and you mean [*Becauſe innocent, and Chriſt died for them, and all the Unbaptized, are ſaved.*] But as I ſee none

of

of your proof of the latter, ſo I will not crookedly crawl into Conformity by the fallacious Expoſition. And you that were, in your laſt Book, uncertain your ſelf of what you can now prove certain, do ſo quickly Change, and ſo quickly publiſh your Change, that your judgment hath the leſs power by any reverence of it to the changing of mine.

QUEST. II.

WHether may *Unconverted ones within the Church, demand and receive the Lord's Supper? Mr.* Baxter *ſaith flatly they may not. Right to Sacram.* pag. 140. The Confutation followeth.

§ 1. *Anſ.* I can bethink me, but of one of theſe three Ends, of this your Writing: 1. Either barely to make a confeſſion of your Faith and Judgment: 2. Or to ſave me from my Error by Conviction: 3. Or to ſave the Readers of my Book from the danger of them.

1. If the firſt be your Work, I confeſs your words [*I conceive*] are ſuitable: But Confeſſions uſe to be otherwiſe, conciſely and orderly formed, and no Adverſaries names beſides *Pilate's*, needed to be put into your Creed.

2. If the ſecond or third be your Work, you ſeem to think very contemptible of my Judgment, and of every ſuch Readers, when you expect that when I have written, and they have read, full Diſputations opening the ſtate of the Queſtion, proving what I aſſert by many Arguments and

Scripture, vindicating twenty Arguments of Mr. *Galeſpies*, from all that is anſwered to them, we ſhould after this be convinced that our Cauſe is wrong, by one that neither will be at the labour diſtinctly to ſtate the Controverſy, nor to reply to my Anſwers already given to all his Reaſonings and much more, nor to anſwer the many Arguments which I and others urge, but ſaith little more of any moment than [*I am induced to think thus, though I once thought otherwiſe :*] Yea, when you neither anſwer our Reaſons, nor give us the tenth part ſo much for your Cauſe as we anſwered, yet we muſt not think that it [*is on ſlight grounds*] that you have taken up your Opinion, *pag.* 16. when what you ſay is ſo ſlight, that as I will not write over again what you vouchſafe not to anſwer ; ſo, if your Reader have read my Book cited by you, I will not ſo reproach his judgment as to think, that he needeth any farther anſwer to this of yours. But if he have not read mine, nor will read it, he is in no danger of being ſeduced by it, and ſo your labour is in vain.

§ 2. But, Reader, leſt ſo ſmall a word as his oft [*I conceive,*] ſhould prove to the unwary Synonimal to [*I deceive,*] I ſhall advertiſe thee briefly.

I. That my way was to diſtinguiſh of Converſion.

1. As from Heatheniſm, or Infidelity, Mahometaniſm, or Hereſie.

2. From groſs Hypocriſie manifeſted by a notorious wicked Life.

3. From cloſe Hypocriſie not proved.

4. From a particular fall of a ſincere Chriſtian,

to

to his integrity; or from ſome tolerable Error and Miſtake.

II. I uſe to diſtinguiſh between *Being ſincere* in the *Chriſtian Faith*, and knowing that we are Sincere.

III. I uſe to define what the *Converſion* is that I ſpeak of, in ſuch Controverſie.

IV. And I never confound the Caſe [*Whether it may be demanded,*] with the Caſe [*whether it may be delivered.*]

V. And I ſtill diſtinguiſh between [*A means which an Unconverted ſelf-knowing Man, is commanded by God to uſe for his Converſion,*] and [a means which God can uſe, or conſequently the Sinner ſhould in the review make uſe of hereunto, ſuppoſing that he hath unlawfully intruded.] As if a Man unlawfully invade the ſacred Miniſterial Office, when he is in it, there is ſomewhat that may become a means of his Converſion: Or if one that hath vowed Celibate, Marry a godly Perſon unlawfully, it may become a means of their Converſion.

Now to make this Controverſie intelligible to the unſtudied, I would here perform all theſe parts, and diſtinctly by Propoſitions open the Matter: But it is done in the *Diſputations of Right to Sacraments*, which he oppoſeth: And if every Nibbling of one that refuſeth the rational task of a ſober Confuter, ſhall call a Man to write new Books, there will be no end of tiring Readers. I doubt I have Erred already, in not letting ſome talk on, and ſhew their Miſtakes and falſe Accuſations without any Confutation.

§ 3. He doth indeed limit the Case to [*the Unconverted within the Church*,] and you would think that by this he excluded Heathens, Mahometans, Infidels, and Hereticks. But remember,

1. That the Baptized not Excommunicate, are in the Universal Church.

2. And that a *particular Church* with him, seems to be nothing but a *worshipping Assembly*; and all that are there are in the Church, and when the Meeting breaks up, the Church is no Church.

3. And yet sometimes you would that think he took a Parish of such Assemblers for a Church.

4. And it is matter of Fact past all dispute, that not only all the Papists, the first ten Years of Queen *Elizabeth*, came to our Churches, and some do so still; but that abundance such as aforesaid, come to the Parish Churches, who in Coffee-Houses talk against Christianity, or the immortality of the Soul, or the Scriptures, and such as write Books to the same purposes; and these are not converted from Sadducism, Beastiality, or Infidelity.

5. And then mark whether any of this Brother's Arguments do prove, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, was ordained for such Men to use for their Conversion.

§ 4. Remember that the *full Conversion to Saving-Sincerity*, is nothing else but [*sincere Consent to the Baptismal Covenant.*] And every such only such (Adult) are savingly Consenter, and that it is not *that Covenant*, converted. And is omitted: To believe in when any *essential part*, or not in the *Holy* the *Father* and not the Son. Now the Person in *Ghost*, is not that Covenant: Now

questi-

queſtion, *To receive the Sacrament as the Sacrament*, (Baptiſm, or the Euchariſt) and not to *profeſs Conſent* to the *Covenant*, is a contradiction; no Man can do it: *Covenanting* is *eſſential* to it. And it is eſſential to it to be by God's Commiſſion a *Solemn actual inveſting Delivery, with application to the juſt receiver of a ſaving Right to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and actual preſent pardon of Sin, and right to Life.*

§ 5. And the Perſon in queſtion is either,

1. One that *Conſenteth not, and knoweth that he conſenteth not.*

2. Or that *Conſenteth not and thinks he doth*, becauſe he conſenteth to ſome part.

3. Or one that *conſenteth not, and knoweth not whether he do or not.*

(4. For, as for all true Conſenters that know not that they do it ſincerely, they are Converted Perſons, and not thoſe in Queſtion: And a true Conſenter that doubteth of his truth, but upon his beſt ſelf-trial, thinks that he truly conſenteth to have God for his God, and Chriſt for his Saviour, and the Holy Ghoſt for his Sanctifier, muſt go without certainty upon the beſt judgment that he make of himſelf.)

I. Now for the Perſon that *conſenteth not, and knoweth it*, to come and demand the Sacrament for his Converſion, is all one as to ſay, that [*It is God's Ordinance, that he is not willing after all perſuaſions, to give up himſelf to God, as his Father, Saviour, and Sanctifier, and therefore hath no right to Pardon and Life, ſhall ſolemnly profeſs that he doth conſent to the Covenant when he doth not, and that he doth preſently by Vow give up himſelfe to*

God, as his God and Father, Saviour and Sanctifier, when he doth not; that this may convert them to do that which lyingly he ſaith he doth: And he ſhall take the inveſting pardoning Sign and Act, when he hath no right to Pardon.] Deceive not your ſelf, or others: *Giving and Taking, Eating and Drinking*, are as *Speaking* (ſignificant Actions) eſſentially to the Sacrament: And he never received the Sacrament eſſentially as that Sacrament, that did not thereby interpretatively ſolemnly profeſs, *q. d.* [*I now conſent to the Covenant of Chriſt, and take God in Chriſt for my Father, Saviour and Sanctifier, and here give up my ſelf to him in theſe Relations.*] And therefore all the Ancients taught, that the *Baptized* were all *certainly preſently pardoned*; ſuppoſing that they really conſented to the Baptiſmal Covenant, as every adult Baptized Perſon did, and muſt profeſs.

And can you believe that this was Chriſt's Inſtitution, *q. d.* [*Come and ſolemnly be Perjured, and Lye, and ſay, Thou conſenteſt to the Covenant when thou deſt not, that this may convert thee to Conſent.* All your miſtaken row of words, will never make this foul Cauſe fair.

2. But what if it be a Man that conſenteth not but thinketh he doth, or yet doth not know?

Anſ. It is his Sin not to know that he conſenteth not; and that will not make it lawful for him to Lye, and Vow falſly. But the harder it is for him to know his own Mind, the more excuſable he is: And a falſe entrance is not a Sin that is unpardonable, nor is the Sinner uncurable, but may be converted in the Church, though he came in unlawfully.

§ 6. While

§ 6. While prepoſterouſly you tell us who you think hath right to Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, you paſs over the Fundamental Controverſie, as if you *knew* it not; which is, *What Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper are.* This is it that we are moſtly diſagreed about: End this, and end all. I ſuppoſe you take Baptiſm to be the firſt Sacrament, and that leſs is not neceſſary to the Lord's Supper than to it. And I preſume to tell you, that Chriſt never ordained, nor the Church ever uſed any other Baptiſm of the Adult, than 1. That which delivered the preſent Remiſſion of Sin, and right to Life, to the juſt receiver of Baptiſm; 2. and that which contained on the part of the Receiver, his preſent profeſſion of ſaving Faith and Repentance, that is, his true conſent to the Covenant.

§ 7. The Scripture telleth us, that *Baptiſm ſaveth*, as containing the *anſwer of a good Conſcience to God*: And that as *many as are Baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt, and have profeſſed that they are buried with him by Baptiſm into his Death, and raiſed with him to newneſs of Life*, &c.

§ 8. God in great Mercy hath delivered down to us from the Apoſtles, the form of Baptiſm by a fuller Tradition than the words of the Scripture, or any things elſe of our Religion are delivered. All Ages and Churches to this Day, have retained the ſame form as to all the Eſſential parts: The very words of the Baptizer and the Baptized, the *Credo*, *Abrenuncio*, &c. profeſſed full ſhew that all uſed this one Baptiſm, which was a profeſſed Vow and Covenanting with God, and renouncing

nouncing of the Flesh, the World, and the Devil, for present (delivered) pardon and right to Christ and Life. See the long List in *Gataker* against *Davenant*, of the Ancients that took all the Baptized for justified.

In a word, If you make another Species of Baptism, which hath lower Conditions and Gifts only than these, I am past doubt;

1. That you introduce a new sort of Christianity.

2. That you hereby would change the very Essence of the Church, and wofully corrupt it: A worse thing than to impose new Ceremonies.

3. That by denying the truth of so universal concurrent Tradition, as the form of Baptism hath, you will shake Mens Faith by weakning the Credit of that Tradition, by which we have received the Bible: It being a harder matter to keep all the words of such a Book, than the Form of Baptism, used on every Christian in the World.

4. That you will too grosly reproach all the Christian Churches, as if they had in all Ages and Places been ignorant what Christening and Christianity is, and had used a false Baptism, till of late.

5. You will contradict the Church of *England* which you Conform to, and all the Churches now in the World, which in their form of Baptizing, and their Catechisms and Confessions tell us, of no Baptism, but what is a *present Covenanting with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, as consenters to his Covenant, giving up our selves to him in the foresaid Relations, for present Pardon, &c. See *Dr. Hammond's Pract. Cat.* of the Baptismal Vow.

And

And is all this fit Work for two or three ſingular Men? To deny the ſaid Hiſtory, is to be groſly Ignorant, or Immodeſt.

§ 9. And now I am aſhamed to trouble you and the Reader with the opening of all your Impertinencies and Contradictions, of ["*That Man* "*will not be perſuaded to conſent to the Baptiſmal* "*Covenant, and to be a Chriſtian indeed, doth yet* "*ſigh, and groan, and pray for that which he* "*would not have*; and that the *Impenitent muſt* "*penitently uſe this means for Penitence; and be-* "*cauſe whoſoever will muſt come and take the Wa-* "*ter of Life, therefore they that will not take it* "*muſt take the Sacrament: And that the outward* "*Act, which is falſe Vowing themſelves to God,* "*and ſaying, They conſent to the Covenant when* "*they do not, is the means of Grace appointed for* "*their Converſion, in which they do well, and are* "*accepted: And that Non-conſenters may fly to* "*Chriſt as a merciful Phyſician to ſave Souls, and* "*caſt themſelves at his Feet, Repenting, Praying,* "*and crying for Mercy (which they would not* "*have) and yet if they come with particular ill* "*intentions, away with them.*] Confute what I have written to the contrary if you would convince me, or any Man that hath read my Five Diſputations.

QUEST.

QUEST. III.

"WHether *a Miniſter may put from the Sa-*
"*crament thoſe of his Pariſh who be*
"*Chriſtned People, and come to Church,*
"*and joyn in the Publick Worſhip, and tender them-*
"*ſelves to receive, being under no ſentence of Ex-*
"*communication*? You ſay, *He may not.*

Anſ. § 1. 1. What's this to the Primitive Churches that were not Pariſhes? Or to the Countries that yet are not ſettled into Pariſh Churches? Or to ſuch Churches as are but tolerated among Papiſts Pariſhes?

2. And all that is here mentioned, the Papiſts did for the firſt ten Years of Queen *Elizabeth.*

3. And remember that we have in our Pariſhes, many that are open Atheiſts, Infidels, Sadduces, Perſecutors, Scorners of the Scripture and Religion, open boaſting impenitent Whore-mongers, Blaſphemers, Drunkards, *&c.* and many that openly deny the Miniſtry, and Sacraments; and yet to avoid Penalty, and for Cuſtom, will do all that is here named, though they deride it: And that all theſe are to be received (though alſo you ſuppoſe that they never ſo much as profeſſed conſent to the Baptiſmal Covenant) you take on you to prove.

1. *Becauſe it is the Will of Chriſt.* [Oh! Brother, dread ſuch additions to Chriſt's Words.] And how is that proved? Why, [*None but Dogs and Swine muſt be denied holy things.*]

Anſ.

Anſ. 1. Where found you that [*None elſe?*]

2. How prove you that none of theſe *are Dogs or Swine*?

3. Yea, are not all they ſwiniſh deſpiſers of Grace, who will not be perſuaded to conſent that God ſhall be their God, and Chriſt their Saviour, and the Holy Ghoſt their Sanctifier, and give up themſelves to him in theſe Relations?

§ 2. Yet *Page* 30. the Caſe is this, [" *If the* " *People being Chriſtened do make a credible pro-* " *feſſion of true Chriſtianity, or a profeſſion of true* " *Chriſtianity which we cannot prove to be falſe,* " *at leaſt by a violent Preſumption, we muſt accept* " *their Profeſſion and admit them.*]

Anſ. This is mine as cited, and the plain truth. But,

1. Did you think that a *credible profeſſion of true Chriſtianity*, is not a credible profeſſion of Converſion? Are not true Chriſtians ſaved? What elſe are Men to be Converted to?

2. Do all ſuch as are afore *deſcribed*, make ſuch a credible profeſſion of true Chriſtianity?

§ 3. You tell us that the Standard that Chriſt hath ſet is that, [" *If now thou be ſincerely Pen-* " *tent, thy Sin is pardoned, and thou haſt right to* " *Salvation, and mayſt come to the Lord's Table.*]

Anſ. And doth not this imply, that elſe he ſhould not come? And is ſuch a Man Unconverted?

It is too irkſome to rake up the reſt of your Contradictions, and examine your ſlight words of the Parable of the Tares: But that rooting up the Tares forbidden is *Excommunicating*, or denying *Sacramental Communion* to any Pariſhioner of

of your Deſcription, who will believe that knoweth?

1. What Chriſt ſaith, *Mat.* 18. 15. *&c.* and *Paul*, 1 Cor. 5. and 2 *Theſſ.* 3. *Tit.* 3. 10, 11, &c.

2. Or he that knoweth that the Univerſal Church of Chriſt in all Ages, hath been of another mind; and indeed went at laſt too far againſt it, having no puniſhment for Chriſtians, but Suſpenſion and Excommunication.

3. And that the Chriſtian World at this day is of another mind, though the *Helvetians* are too remiſs in the Principles, and moſt in the Practice.

4. And that the Canons of this Church requireth the Miniſter to deny the Sacrament to ſome ſuch as you deſcribe: And in your former Book, you pleaded this as for Conformity: And are you changed already? And ſhall any Wiſe Man follow ſuch quick Changes?

5. The Church of *England* forbids us to give the Sacrament to any that are not Confirmed, and deſire it not, or are not ready: But ſuch are many of your Deſcription.

6. If the power of Excommunicating over a thouſand, or many hundred Churches be confined to the Biſhop and the Chancellor, or Officials, and ſo all the Pariſh Miniſters denied it, and diſabled, all theſe Churches muſt be Prophaned and Confounded at the will of one Man, or becauſe he cannot do an Impoſſibility. And the reaſons why Chriſt would have his Church to be viſibly Holy, and a Communion of Saints, and openly differenced from the *notoriouſly ungodly*, are ſo many

and

and ſo great, that I will not here attempt the opening of them, having often elſewhere done it.

QUEST. IV.

"WHether *the common ſort of ungodly Chri-*
"*ſtians, are to be caſt out of the Church*
"*by Penal Excommunications, and*
"*uſed as Excommunicate ones?* You ſay, [*I con-*
"*ceive not.*]

Anſ. Would any one that pretended to confute our Errors, no better open the caſe in queſtion.

1. In your ſenſe they are Chriſtians that never profeſſed conſent to the Baptiſmal Covenant, but only took the Water in order to Converſion hereafter. Theſe are no viſible Chriſtians: And I ſuppoſe by parity of Reaſon, the Council of *Nice*, which decreed the Rebaptizing of the Paulmiſts, would have been for Rebaptizing theſe.

2. Is the *Ordinarineſs* the ſatisfying Character, who is not to be Excommunicated? In one Country thoſe are *ordinary*, that are *extraordinary* in others: In ſome places *Arrians* are ordinary; in ſome *Socinians*; in ſome *Papiſts*; in ſome open Scorners of the Scripture, Chriſtianity, and Religion: In ſome ignorant Perſons that know not the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity, nor will learn, or let the Miniſter inſtruct them any where but in the Pulpit; in many Pariſhes here, not one of many (their Neighbours ſay) go to Church about once or twice a Year. 1 Cor. 5. 13. *Put away from among you that wicked Perſon*, ver. 11. *If any Man that*

is

is called a Brother, be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or an Idolater, or a Railer, or a Drunkard, or an Extortioner, with ſuch a one, no not to eat. Do not ye judg them that are within, 2 Theſſ. 3. It is the *idle* and *diſorderly*: And theſe are ordinary in ſome places.

But we eaſily grant that *Excommunications* are not to be uſed Tyranically, or when they do more hurt than good. And if the Body of a Church turn, *e. g. Socinians*, or profeſſedly ungodly, and will not be Reformed, the Excommunication which we plead for is, but withdrawing from them and renouncing their Communion, declaredly.

§ 2. I have oft ſaid, that *Perfidious Covenant-breakers who live in groſs Sin, and ſtill tell the Miniſter they repent, and will not be perſuaded to leave their Sin, (e. g. Whoredom, Drunkenneſs, Stealing, Perjury, Blaſphemy,) have ſo far forfeited the credit of their bare word, that the Paſtor ſhould ſee their actual amendment before he Abſolve them.* And now your Hand is in, the World muſt be ſaved from this Doctrine too. But becauſe it is a common principle in Nature, and in all Church Canons, and the common judgment of Divines, I will not ſtay to diſpute it with you. But when you are a Maſter of a Family, if you think Family Diſcipline a Duty, Experience will cure your credulity: If your Servant or Son beat you, or ſpit in your Face, or Rob you once a Day, or Week, but for one Year together, and ſay ſtill after it, *I repent*. But what will not Men talk for?

QUEST.

QUEST. V.

WHether *Mr.* Baxter's *Doctrine and Principles concerning particular Churches be ſound and good?* And you confute them.

Anſ. 1. Thoſe that read them are in no danger by them. And thoſe that do, may be confirmed by ſo ſlight a confutation (as I ſaid.)

2. As for my Book of [*Univerſal Concord of all Chriſtian Churches,*] I know that the Devil hateth it ſo much, that I expect ſome far more ſubtile Aſſault than yours; or elſe I ſhall think that the Devil wanteth wit or power, more than is commonly believed. But I am ſorry that he hath drawn ſo good a Man to be his inſtrument.

§ 1. My firſt mentioned Error is [*That a particular Church is a regular part of the Univerſal Church, as a City is of a Kingdom.*] The confutation is [*In this I conceive he is out: A particular Church is to the Church Univerſal with a ſingle Town, conſiſting of a Magiſtrate Governing, and People governed, according to the general Rules and Principles of Society, is to all the World.*

Anſ. The proof is [*I conceive he is out,*] and an Aſſertion in other words of the ſame that is denied; and ſo we are *out both* (or neither.)

1. I uſed the *Name*, and he the *Definition:* It may be he thought that by [*City*] I had meant only ſuch Towns as are ſo called in *England:* But methinks he ſhould know that the word πόλις, ſignifieth all ſuch Towns as he defineth, and that it is the common definition of *Civitas* which he

he giveth us, as all Politicks ſpeak *de Civitate*: It is therefore the ſame ſubject in the Similitude, which we both ſpeak of.

2. The difference then muſt be between the words [Kingdom] and [World.] I ſay, *A Church is ſuch a part of the Univerſal, as a City is of a Kingdom*: He ſaith, no, but [*as a City is of the World.*] What a dangerous Error hath he detected? But, *All the World is God's Kingdom*: And as *it hath* but *one King*, ſo I thought I might liken it to a *Kingdom* that hath one *King*, but a multitude of Corporations; without ſtretching the Similitude to intend that [*This Kingdom is not a part of the World.*]

§ 2. My ſecond Error is, [" *He that will be a* " *Member of a particular Church, muſt cohabit, or* " *dwell near.*] The confutation is, [*I conceive* " *he is out.*]

Anſ. What, is he againſt Pariſh Churches after all this? No: He only denieth it of a *tranſient* Member *pro tempore* as a Traveller, and granteth it as to a *ſtated* Member. And yet I am out. Many and many a time have I written of Churches, and uſe to diſtinguiſh firſt of the Equivocal Name, ſaying, That an occaſional meeting of Chriſtians for Worſhip, may be called a Church, and a tranſient Chriſtian *pro tempore* a Member: I have written more this way than ever he did. But declared that it is a *ſettled Political Society* that I defined, when I ſpeak of what he now accuſeth. And why ſhould a wiſe and good Man thus haſtily trouble the World and make diſcord by pretending, becauſe he cannot have leiſure to know, what he ſpeaks againſt?

§ 3. My

§ 3. My third Error is, [“*That to the being of* “*a particular Church there is neceſſary a mutual Co-* “*venant, or expreſt conſent between Paſtor and Peo-* “*ple, even every Member, and the more expreſs the* “*better: And I define a Church to be a Society of* “*Chriſtians conſiſting of Paſtor and People aſſocia-* *ted by conſent.*]

The force of the Confutation is, [*I conceive he is out.*] But wherein is it? We have here ſuch work as I never met with before.

1. He granteth that none are to each other, *Paſtor and People againſt their Wills.* Good ſtill. And yet do I err? [“*But* (ſaith he) *as Chriſt is Chriſt,* “*and a Saviour by Office whether Sinners will or* “*not: So faithful Miniſters are Paſtors by Office,* “*whether the People accept them or no.*] Reader, it is not the leaſt blemiſh of my Writings, that on divers occaſions I oft repeat the ſame things: And many a time have I diſtinctly ſaid, 1. That the *Ordainers* judge who ſhall be a Miniſter of Chriſt in general. 2. The Magiſtrate is judge whom he will Countenance, Maintain, or Tolerate. 3. And the People muſt be *conſenting judges* to whom they will truſt the conduct of their Souls: As it's one thing to be a Licenſed Phyſician, and another to be Phyſician to this Hoſpital, or Perſon. If this Brother mean otherwiſe, what meant he by ſaying, that *No Man can be a Paſtor to a People againſt their will?* Doth he ſay, and unſay in the next Lines? Is Chriſt any Man's actual Saviour whether they believe in him, and accept him or not? I have oft ſaid, that in divers Caſes, the People may be *bound in duty to Conſent*, as all are *bound to be Chriſtians:* But they are no *Chriſtians*, or *Church-members*, till

they *do Consent*: What then is it that he meaneth as our Difference?

§ 4. Yes: He ſaith, [" *No more is neceſſary to* " *the being, or well-being of a particular Church* " *than this; A company of Chriſtians met together in* " *publick for the Solemn Worſhip of God by Jeſus* " *Chriſt, having a Paſtor or Miniſter with them to* " *guide and govern the Congregation, and edifie him-* " *ſelf and them by the Word and Sacraments; where* " *there is no Aſſembly of Paſtor and People there is no* " *Church, and no longer than the Aſſembly laſteth* " *are they a Church.*]

Anſ. Did the World ever here this Doctrine before? When the Church at *Jeruſalem*, *Corinth*, *Cenchrea*, *Coloſſe*, *Laodicea*, &c. and the Churches in *Judea*, *Galatia*, &c. are mentioned, when the Apoſtles ordained them Elders in every Church, *Acts* 14. 23. *Tit.* 1. 3, 5. *&c.* Is the word *Church* here taken for no Chriſtians longer than they are Aſſembled? Doth not Scripture, Canons, Fathers, and all Writers ſpeak of Churches as *Aſſociated Chriſtians*, remaining Churches all the Day, and Year, and not only while Aſſembled? If the word Church may be taken for a Tranſient Aſſembly, doth it follow that there is *no other?* Have we ſo many Books of Eccleſiaſtical Policie, if there be no Political Society that is a particular Church? What an unpleaſing *talk* is it to be put on a defence againſt ſuch an Opponent?

§ 5. Saith he [" *I would but ask Mr.* Baxter, ' *what is it that you mean* by *Aſſociated by conſent?*]

Anſ. Have I in the Books, cited by you, ſo largely told you what I mean, and muſt you print the Queſtion before you will take an Anſwer? Saith he

he [" *Either you mean bare Aſſembling, or ſome* " *other thing.*] *Anſ.* Will you better underſtand me if I write it again than you did before? When I told you at large, in what Caſes expreſs conſent by words, or other ſigns is meet, and that where the Laws ſettle Pariſh Churches, ordinary attendance and ſubmiſſion to the Paſtor's Office muſt be taken for expreſs Conſent? But then I do hold that there is ſuch a Church as I deſcribe, and that the Pariſh is not Unchurcht when the Aſſembly is diſmiſt.

§ 6. He ſaith, [" *When the Aſſembly breaks up,* " *the Church for that time ceaſeth till the Meeting be* " *renewed, till which time they remain Chriſtian In-* " *habitants, Neighbours, Families, Pariſhioners, or* " *Sojourners, the Paſtor of the place dwelling among* " *them.*] *Anſ.* In your Equivocal ſenſe of a Church, this is true. In the Political ſenſe they are a Church ſtill; as the Parliament, Citizens, Souldiers, are a Parliament, City, Army, when they Aſſemble not. If your wrangle be *de re*, do you deny their *continued Relation*? If it be *de nomine*, let the Scripture and all Nations judge, whether the name *Church* belong to them no longer than they are Aſſembled.

1. Then all that ſtay at Home, or are Sick, are no Church-members.

2. Then the Biſhop or Paſtor, hath no Church but while Aſſembled: And he hath no Duty to perform for his Church, but while Aſſembled.

3. This is quite contrary to our Dioceſans, who ſay (as honeſt Mr. *Cawdry* himſelf) that a Dioceſs is the firſt particular Church, and that it is no matter how many Aſſemblies it conſiſt of, and that there is no Church without a Biſhop, and ſo that

we have no more Churches than Biſhops.

4. If a Biſhop build a Temple on *London* Road, where Travellers ſhall be his ordinary Hearers, whom he ſhall never ſee again, this is a Temporary Tranſient Church; but verily it is another ſort Church that is deſcribed in Scripture, and by *Ignatius*, *Cyprian*, and all Church-writers. And when the Biſhop was to viſit the Sick, and take care of the Poor, and to exhort from Houſe to Houſe, it was as for a *Church*, and not meerly as for Chriſtian Neighbours: And do you think no more conſent was neceſſary to his ſpecial Duty to theſe more than to others, and theirs to him, than bare Aſſembling? Atheiſts, Infidels, Hereticks, may Aſſemble with the reſt; and Catechumens ordinarily did ſo, and were never made themſelves the judges, whether and when they ſhould be Baptized and admitted to Communion; but the Paſtors were the judges.

§ 7. As to your oft mentioning the words [*Covenants and Oaths*] for ſuch Church Aſſociations, as if I had written for *Oaths*, or had not written againſt all *needleſs Covenants*, which though you ſay not, your words would make the Reader believe, whilſt over and over it is but *Conſent competently expreſſed*, which I require; thoſe that know not your Honeſty as I do, I doubt will judge it to ſavour of ſome worſe Cauſe than I am willing to name. If Conſent be not expreſſed, how ſhall it be known? And I ſtill ſay *Cæteris paribus*, the plaineſt Expreſſions are fitteſt to attain their End, as the plaineſt Language is counted the beſt for Communication: Oh! how much did *Cyprian*, and all the old Churches differ from you about conſent!

§ 8. Another

§ 8. Another of my Errors is to ſay, [*He is an Invader, that without conſent intrudeth into their Priviledges.*] *Anſ.* 1. But it is not he that tranſiently cometh into the Temple; 2. But he that will make himſelf one of my ſpecial Charge, and oblige me to all the duty which I owe to my Charge and cannot pay to all Men, and he that will claim a Vote in chooſing the Biſhop, *&c.* And if of old one of your mind had ſaid, That every Traveller or Stranger, that cometh within the Room, may claim the Sacrament without any *Literæ Communicatoriæ*, upon his bare word, the Biſhops or Churches would not have believed you; ſo ſingular are you in all this.

You tell us, *God hath made no ſuch Corporations, and every Chriſtian is a Freeman*, &c. *Anſ.* But how ſhall I know whether every Stranger that cometh in be a Chriſtian, or was ever Baptized? Or be not a Heretick Excommunicate by other Churches? Or if I am able to do the Office of a Paſtor but for 500, and thouſands more will come and claim it?

§ 9. Another of my Errors is, that *Pariſh Chappels and Oratories, are no true Churches.* *Anſ.* You ſhould not thus become an Incendiary, by pretending things that you will not firſt underſtand: Where do I ſay what you affirm? I ſay, That there may be ſeveral Chappels that are but parts of one Church. 2. And I ſay, That if a Biſhop be Eſſential to a Church, then none below a Dioceſs is a Church; and therefore that they that ſo affirm, do put down all Pariſh Churches and turn them into meer Chappels and Oratories, which are but parts of a Church. 3. I never ſaid, That if a

place called in *English* a Chappel (yea, if a Barn, or Field, or Ship,) have such a Pastor and People meeting, as a Church must be Constituted of, that they are no true Church. 4. But if such Pastors and People related as one Church, are by Persecution forced to meet in several Houses, or the Sick, Weak, or Distant, to meet sometime at a Chappel, or without a true Pastor; if a Deacon pray with some of them in a House, or Oratory, this maketh not a Church Political, in the sense that I told you I used that word in; but in another (Equivocal) sense it may be called a Church, and so a Family may be.

If this be false you should have confuted it, and not wrangle in the Dark.

§ 10. You say that I blame the Bishops for putting down *all the Parish Bishops and Churches—when I my self do no less by putting down all the Chapple Ministers, Chappel Meetings and Oratories, and denying them to be proper Pastors and Churches. Ans.* All false, or a meer Game at Equivocal words: The word *Chappel* usually signifieth a place for the Assembling of some small part of a Church, with a Curate, or Houshold Chaplain, who hath only power to Preach and Pray, (and sometimes to give the Sacrament) but not to Govern: Sometime a Chappel may have a Governing Pastor, and People subject to him in that relation, and differeth but in name from the Parish Church. It is a meer Chappel or Oratory, in the common sense, which I say is not a Political Church.

The falshood of your pretended parity of the Cases I prove: Those Congregations which are Constituted of Ministers of different Species, are

not

not of the ſame Species and Definition: But meer Oratories, or Chappels, which have no Paſtors that have the power of the Keys for Government, and Pariſh Churches which have ſuch Paſtors according to the Divine Inſtitution, are conſtituted of Miniſters of different Species: *Ergo*, They are not of the ſame Species and Definition (as you affirm.)

2. Thoſe Aſſemblies which intentionally meet but as parts of the loweſt Political Church, and thoſe that intentionally meet as the whole or main Body of that Political Church, are not of the ſame Species and Definition. (No more than a Squadron, and a Captain's Company, or Troop; or a Family, and a Village or Town.) But, *&c.*

If Biſhops deny all the Lord's Chaplains to have the governing power of the Keys, and their Family-Chappels to be true Political Churches of the ſame Species and Definition with a Dioceſan Church, or a Parochial; do you confute them if you can, I cannot. But if I prove that every Parochial, or other proper Political Church *infimæ Speciei*, ſhould by Divine Order have a Paſtor that hath the governing power of the Keys, and the Biſhops deny them any ſuch, and will have but one ſuch in a Dioceſs; do you defend them if you can, I cannot: Nor are theſe Caſes the ſame.

§ 11. My next Error, "[*He cannot tell whether I* "*hold or no: But it ſeems I do; againſt compelling* "*Men to take whom the Magiſtrate pleaſe for their* "*Paſtors:* For I make *Covenanting Eſſential, as be-* "*tween a Husband and Wife; likening the Church* "*Univerſal to a Kingdom, and particular Churches* "*to Cities and Corporations.*] And here he talks of the *Corporation Oath*, and exclaimeth ["*Is*

" *this the way of curing Church Diviſions? And is* " *this the true and only way of Concord?*

Anſ. Had you publiſhed and proved to us a better way, I hope we ſhould have been thankful; and ſo will I, if you will truly ſhew me the Errors of the way that I commended. 1. He that hath read my Books which plead for no Oaths, nor for any Covenanting, but *expreſt conſent to the Relations and Offices*, will perhaps think that here you were tempted to Injuſtice at the leaſt.

2. Is not the Church Univerſal Chriſt's Kingdom? I rather liken it to a Kingdom, than to the World, becauſe (whatever you think) I think it is not by Chriſt ſubdivided into many particular Kingdoms as the World is, but only into many particular Churches, keeping neceſſary Concord, (and Obedience to Magiſtrates.) It is not one ſort only that militate againſt the Cure of *Diviſions*, by *true Concord*; but I am ſorry that you are become one. *Let him that thinks he ſtands, take heed leſt he fall.*

§ 12. He ſaith, [*It is Qualification that maketh Chriſtians.*] *Anſ.* No Qualifications without Conſent and Covenanting with Chriſt.

And [" *It is Qualification and juſt Ordination,* " *which makes Chriſtian* Paſtors *and Miniſters at* " *large.*] *Anſ.* Do you confute me by repeating my one words? And (ſaith he) [" *It is their being placed by the Magiſtrate in the ſeveral* " Pariſhes, *which makes them* Paſtors *by Office,* " *and relation to all the Chriſtian Souls in the Pa-* " *riſhes reſpectively.— If Jeſus Chriſt ſhall by the* " *Hand of the Magiſtrate ſet a faithful Miniſter in* " *the* Pariſh, *he becomes as to Office and Right a Pa-*

" *ſtor,*

" *ſtor, a Guide, a Miniſter, and Teacher to their* " *Souls. If they receive him not, they are Rebels* " *and Traytors againſt Chriſt, and are no longer* " *Chriſtian People, ſave as an Adulterous Wife,* &c.]

Anſ. Alas, where can we ſay a Man will ſtop when he is once tumbling down the Hill!

1. Why, did you think your bare word ſhould ſerve for this? That it is Jeſus Chriſt that made this the Office of the Magiſtrate?

2. Is it all Magiſtrates, or ſome only that have this Power, and Jeſus Chriſt chooſeth us Paſtors by? If but ſome, what the better are we for your Diſcourſe, if you tell us not how to know them?

And, 3. Will you not then put the People upon a harder and more perilous Task, to judge of all Magiſtrates fitneſs for this Truſt, than it would be to judge of their Paſtor.

4. If it be all, then Heathens and Turks muſt chooſe Chriſtians their Paſtors. If you ſay, It is all Chriſtian Magiſtrates, then the Proteſtants in *France* are Rebels and not Chriſtians, for refuſing Papiſts Prieſts: If it be not Papiſts, who are they? Muſt all receive *Lutherans*, or *Socinians*, or *Anabaptiſts*, or ſuch like Paſtors that live under Impoſing Princes of thoſe minds?

5. Why do you limit it to [*faithful Miniſters*] who muſt judge of their *Faithfulneſs* and *Qualifications*? If the Magiſtrate, Papiſts, Socinians, Prophane Magiſtrates, or Heretical, will judge as they are. If the People, we are wheeled about to that which is reſiſted: And then, *When is it that they muſt judge*, before they receive him, or after? If before, then muſt they have *trial* of him, or take all for (*Faithful*) that are ordained by a Biſhop? or

that

that Being Strangers, they know no harm by him? or all the Patrons present? If so, we come to the forementioned Misery. If they must receive them first, and try them after, and depart from them when they shew themselves unfaithful; then the People must either depose their Pastors, or separate: And most that separate from the Parish Churches, do it as thinking the Ministers unfaithful: And is this *your Cure* of Church-divisions? And if *never Preaching* be a proof of the Unqualified, the Canon forbids us to go from such. And in some Countrys there are none within reach to go to from them: And if there be, the Canon suspendeth them if they receive one to their Communion, that goeth from a *Non-preaching* Minister.

6. Did any one Church on Earth receive a Pastor by the Magistrates imposition for the first 300 Years? Or had not the Churches then rightly called Pastors?

7. Did not the Orthodox Churches commonly refuse Bishops, which *Valens*, and such Erroneous Emperors set over them?

8. Were not Parish Ministers chosen by the Bishops and People, and not by Magistrates for 1400 Years in all known Churches in the World? It was but the Patriarchs at first that were imposed on the People by the Emperors; and afterwards when the *Henrys* contended with the Pope, it was not for choice of Priests, but for the Investiture of *Bishops and Abbots* only; and in this they left the *choice* to the *People and Clergie*, and pleaded but for *Investiture per baculum & annulum*; so that for ought I know, Magistrates never imposed Priests on Parish Churches till the Reformation: And since then, be-

sides

ſides *Helvetia* and *Belgia*, it is but few that do it. And even in *England*, it is not done by Magiſtracy, but by *Patrons preſenting*, and *Dioceſan Prelates Inſtituting*. So that if this be Chriſt's *Way* of making Paſtors to particular Churches, there were no true Paſtors or Churches for 300 Years, and perhaps none, or next none for 1400 Years in Pariſhes: And if this Doctrine be true, the Catholick Chriſtians in many Princes Reigns that rejected impoſed Biſhops (if that were as bad as rejecting Pariſh Prieſts) were *Rebels and Traytors againſt Chriſt, and no Chriſtians.* And whether he ſo Stigmatize not the *Univerſal Church* for want of ſuch Reception of Prieſts, in almoſt all Ages, I wiſh him to conſider. And whether that be like to be a better way of Concord, which he and few ſuch in the end of the World deviſe, to the condemning of the Churches of all the former Ages, that never had any ſuch Concord?

9. Hereby alſo he leaveth the Tolerated Churches in *France*, *Germany*, and all the *Greek* Churches, and *Copties*, and *Syrians*, &c. that are under adverſe Princes, to be without Paſtors ſent in the way of Chriſt's Appointment. (And yet vouchſafeth not to name one Text where Chriſt ever Appointed it.)

10. And when he maketh *all in a Pariſh* to be the Paſtors *Flock, or Charge*, that are *Chriſtians*, he condemneth thoſe Canons that ordained, that if *Any Biſhop convert not the Hereticks in his City, they ſhall be his Flock who doth convert them*; and all that have had *two Churches* in one Pariſh. Or elſe he maketh Pariſh Prieſts to be Pluraliſts, and if there be many Chappels and Churches in his Pariſh,

riſh, he is the Paſtor to them all: And yet he never tells us whether the Chappel Prieſt be alſo Paſtor of the *reſt of the Pariſh*: And if ſo, whether each be to Govern diſtinctly, or one ſubordinately as Governed by the other; Or whether both muſt *agree*, each being but part of the Governing power.

11. The ſame Man ſaith, *That multitudes of Pariſhioners are Rebels, Traytors, and no Chriſtians*, &c. and yet that we muſt give them all the Sacrament if demanded. For multitudes demand the Sacrament to ſatisfie Law and Cuſtom, who declare that they take not the Prieſt for their Paſtor, nor as Authorized by Chriſt; and multitudes that know not what Chriſtianity or a Sacrament is, and will not ſpeak with the Miniſter about it.

12. Did not he ſay before, that the Man cannot be their Paſtor without his own and the Peoples conſent? And yet the Magiſtrate may make me a Paſtor to the Pariſh? What? Whether I will or not? Am I alſo a Rebel, Traytor, and no Chriſtian, if I refuſe? What if the Pariſh have 60000, or 40000 Souls, and I am not able to do a Paſtor's Office for 500? What if I think it is a Sin to be obtruded on diſſenting unwilling People? And if my Diſſent do not *Unchriſten me*, why doth the People's *Unchriſten them*? The Lord pity us, we need no Enemies but our ſelves to ſeduce us and deſtroy; nor any to make the moſt odious Schiſms than the decryers of Schiſm. What Schiſmatick doth condemn ſo many Chriſtians and Churches, as this Cenſure? I can ſcarce except Mr. *Dodwel*, whom in his laſt Book he called an *odd diſowned Man*.

§ 13. He tells us after of the Paſtor's Duty to teach

teach Publickly, and from Houſe to Houſe: And yet it's no Church but when Aſſembled; and he hath equal charge of all Chriſtians (though Papiſts) in the Pariſh.

§ 14. He ſaith, [*No thing cuts off from a Church particular, but what cuts off from Chriſt, Chriſtianity, and the Church Univerſal.*]

Anſ. 1. What if a Man diſown only the Paſtor of that Church? 2. What if he will not joyn with them in the Liturgy, or Mode of Worſhip there uſed? 3. What if that Church be *Neſtorians*, or *Eutychians*, or Papiſts, and he ſeparates from them, or they caſt him out? 4. What if he remove his Dwelling?

§ 15. Next I am cenſured for *demanding the People of* Kederminſter's *conſent to my Miniſtry, and their Church Relation.* And he will now be diſtinct, and maketh Anſwers to diſtinct Queſtions for them: But never tells us whether ſuch Anſwers had been *true* or *falſe*, if they had given them.

His firſt Queſtion is, [*Do we take you to have the juſt qualifications of a Paſtor?*] And the Anſwer is, [*Learning is one qualification of which the Ignorant are incompetent Judges: And for Wiſdom, Holineſs, and Miniſterial skill of Fidelity, you are to make proof of them: This is to be anſwered ſome Years after, and not ask before-hand.*]

And ſo under Papiſts, Socinians, prophane Impoſers, you are to take all as Wiſe, Holy, Faithful, till ſome Years after you find them otherwiſe. Here he expoundeth his former words, for rejecting the *unqualified* and *unfaithful*. But who ſhall be judge at ſome Years after?

His ſecond Queſtion is, [*Do we take you to be*

duly

duly ordained?] And the Answer is, [*We are bound to judge those to be justly Ordained which are so reputed, and we have no reason to suspect.*]

Ans. 1. But *whose* reputation is it that you rest on? Half the Parish say, you are not justly ordained but by a Bishop: The other half say, you are justly ordained by Presbyters: You falsifie, if you feign them all of a mind. 2. And who knows how to define and bound your [*Reasons of Suspicion?*] 3. The Canons and Bishops say, you *have forfeited your License* if you conform not; and without a License you may not Preach. 4. And if you will question no mens orders, you will have many Lay-Pastors.

To his 3d Quest. he answereth, [*We question not your presentation.*] *Ans.* And yet it is the Magistrate that must impose Ministers, and in times of Usurpation he feigneth them to be unquestioned. The sum hitherto is, *We must take any Man for our Pastor, that is Ordained and presented.* But what if I knew that multitudes do not so, doth it make them of that Church because they *should consent* and do not? Of 1800, or 2000 only 600 would come to the Sacrament, (though they usually heard) unless all the rest would receive it kneeling and administred by the Liturgy, though they were left free to use that Gesture themselves; and withal they were told that we had not a *Bishops license*.

The 4th Quest. is, [*If we take you alone for our Pastor?*] And it's answered, [*We know of no other in view but you.*] *Ans.* All these are Fictions. 1. I never desired nor consented to be their Pastor, but to be one of three. 2. I agreed with them in the *Town-Hall publickly in writing, to undertake only a Lecture which I had before the War, in conjunction with another that should have the Presentation or Sequestration.* And yet honest Mr. *Durel* tells the World that it was a rich Benefice given me for my Service under *Cromwel*, (who would never endure me to speak to him.) 3. There were three Competitors: One an old Vicar, that (somehow) preacht once a Quarter, that had the Presentation and was Sequestred. (1. I will not tell you here for what.) 2. His Curate sequestred and removed. 3. An old Chappel Curate, grosly ignorant and vicious, that lived by unlawful Marrying.

4. And by all this you determine that of *three of us*, none

none was Paſtor but only that *one* that had the *Preſentation*; and ſo you depoſe all *other Curates* not preſented. And yet the Chappels that have ſuch Curates put in only by the Parſons are true Churches; ſuch are your frequent Contradictions.

Sect. 16. Next as a meek Queſtioner, he askt me, *Why I will not baptize their Infants, if I take them for Chriſtians and Pariſhioners?* He ſaith after, [*If they make not a tolerable profeſſion of Chriſtianity in the publick Aſſembly, they produce no valid claim, we are not to admit them.*] *Anſ.* I ſuppoſe there are in the three next Pariſhes here, 80000 Perſons whom the Paſtors never had any other account of, as to their knowledg, but by their coming to Church (and half of them that rarely come.) And thoſe of us that have talkt with almoſt all our Pariſhioners, find that multitudes know not what Chriſtianity or a Sacrament is: A man about 80 years old in *Kederminſter* ſaid, *Chriſt was the Sun*, and *the Holy Ghoſt the Moon*: Is ſtanding up at the Creed then, or ſitting in the Church a tolerable profeſſion? *Hobbes* and his followers would do the ſame. 2. But what obligation is on me to baptize all the Children of thoſe that take me for none of their Paſtor? The Pariſh may have 20000 more than I am able to do the Paſtoral Office for: I cannot tell whether they come to Church or not: If they do, they are ſtrangers to me; ſome come into the Pariſh and others go out, and many are Lodgers: And he that as a Paſtor is to Baptize, is alſo to do abundance more, to Catechize, viſit the Sick, the Poor, *&c.* Am I bound to *impoſſibilities* for every ſtranger that I never knew? Nor *can I know* ſo much as whether he be *Chriſtened*, or be indeed a *Pariſhioner*? Yea, a *Church* with you is only a *preſent Aſſembly*: What if theſe perſons aſſemble not, or but twice or thrice a Year? What if Travellers be that day of the Church? Biſhop *Taylor* ſaith (*Prof. of Repen.*) *No one can give account of thoſe that he knoweth not.*

Sect. 17. His talk of the Tares again deſerveth no anſwer, but [*read Expoſitors.*] His repeated inſinuation by the word [*Oaths*, and *Covenants*] tell us that a good man may become un inſinuater of Calumnies.

His two Concluſions, *pag.* 55. from my words are, 1. *That they are no Churches that want this cementing Covenant. Anſ.* They are none that are not ſo *related*

by

by consent expressed, by one way or other: If you turn this into [*cementing Covenant*] when you had newly cited my express denial, that *express Covenanting was necessary, ad esse*, it's worse than Ceremony, which you are already come to think lawful.

The 2d Concl. is, [*The Churches that have it not in the most plain obliging way are defective, spotted, and ill-favoured,*] because I said that the more express way is laudable *ad bene esse*: As if all were called *spotted and ill-favoured*, that want any thing laudable *ad bene esse*. (And will Christ take away his Churches *spots* and *wrinkles, Ephes.* 6. when there were none?)

And he saith, [*Thus he calls the true and only way of the Churches Concord.*] As if every word in the Book were called [*the true and onely Way.*] ['*It rather tendeth* (saith he) *to Discord, and to make every single Minister a Pope, or Church-tyrant, and to make Churches Schismatical and traiterous Combinations, dividing themselves from all other Churches and Christians*, &c.]

Ans. 1. And yet he before said himself, that the *unwilling cannot be Pastor and Flock*: And is not this the same? 2. Thus all Christ's Churches that ever I read of for 300, yea, a 1000 Years, are Stigmatized, who still made *expressed consent* necessary. 3. A Pope is one that claimeth Soveraignty over all the Church on Earth: Doth he do so that taketh none for his Flock, but *Consenters*? 4. Which is *like Tyranny*, not to pretend to Government over any but Volunteers, or to say, *I will Govern you whether you will or not*? 5. Is it Dividing and Schism, to know my Flock as Consenters, and not to take other Mens Flocks *Sine literis Communicatoriis*, as oft as they will dwell or lodg in my Parish? The words [*Oaths,*] and [*Covenants*] are oft again so mentioned by him, and his profession; that he hath the *Episcopal and Presbyterian on his side*, and other untruths so rashly uttered, that I am heartily grieved for the success of his Temptation: And whether he or I be Schismatical, and differ from the Ancient Churches, I refer the Reader to my *Abridg. of Church History*, and to my Citations in my Book of *Right to Sacraments*: My Preface to Mr. *Rawlet's Book of the Sacrament*, confutes some of his Intimations. I thank God that I am going to a more peaceable World.

FINIS.